Imprimatur.

Hen. Maurice RR^mo in Chriſto P. D. Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. à Sacris.

Junii 4. 1687.

Imprimatur.

Hen. Maurice RR^mo in Chriſto P. D. Wilhelmo Archiep. Cant. à Sacris.

Junii 4. 1687.

A

SHORT SUMMARY

OF THE

Principal Controverſies

BETWEEN THE

Church of England,

AND THE

Church of Rome.

BEING

A VINDICATION of ſeveral PROTESTANT DOCTRINES, in ANSWER to a Late PAMPHLET INTITULED,

Proteſtancy deſtitute of Scripture-Proofs.

LONDON,
Printed for **Richard Chiſwell**, at the *Roſe* and *Crown* in S. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVII.

A

SHORT SUMMARY

OF THE

Principal Controversies

BETWEEN THE

Church of England,

AND THE

Church of Rome.

BEING

A VINDICATION of several PROTESTANT

DOCTRINES, in ANSWER to a Late PAMPHLET

INTITULED.

Protestancy destitute of Scripture-Proofs.

LONDON,

Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown

in S. Paul's Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVII.

Place this betwixt the *Title* and the *Book*.

THE CONTENTS.

The State of the Controverſie.

HOW far Proteſtants demand Scripture-proofs for all Doctrines of Religion. Page 2

Proteſtants do not reject all Doctrines, which are not contained in expreſs words of Scripture. 3

But yet require expreſs Scripture-proofs for all neceſſary Articles of Faith, and therefore demand a Scripture-proof for the new Trent-*Articles, the belief of which is made neceſſary to Salvation.* 4

The ſilence of Scripture ſufficient to reject any Doctrine as unſcriptural. 5

Concerning Negative *and* Affirmative *Articles, and the* Requeſter's *blunder about them.* 6

A Review of the ſeveral Proteſtant Tenets, for which He demands a Scripture-proof.

I. *Whether the Scripture be clear in all neceſſaries to every ſober Inquirer. The Scripture proofs of it vindicated.* 8

Page

Proteſtants do not reject the Authority of Church-Guides, and the difference between a Proteſtant and a Popiſh Guide. 10

II. *Concerning the Spiritual Juriſdiction of the Secular Prince* 11

III. *Concerning Juſtification by Faith alone. That juſtifying Faith is a perſuaſion, that we are juſtified, is not the Doctrine of the Church of* England. 12, 13

IV. *Concerning the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine after Conſecration. Whether theſe words,* This is my Body, *can be literally underſtood.* 14, 15

V. *Concerning Chriſt's Preſence in the Euchariſt.* 16

What there is beſides Subſtance and Efficacy belonging to our Saviour's Body and Blood. 17

The difference between the Vertues and Efficacy of an Inſtitution, and the Powers of Nature. ibid.

Sacramental Signs and Symbols as effectual to all the purpoſes of a Sacrament, as Chriſt's Natural Fleſh and Blood could be. 18, 19

What a Sacrament of the Lord's Body means, and how diſtinguiſhed from his Natural Fleſh and Blood. 20

How the Communion of Chriſt's Body and Blood in the Euchariſt differs from the meer influences of his Grace. ibid.

VI. *Concerning the Adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, whether it be Idolatry. To adore Chriſt is not Idolatry, to adore Bread and Wine is.* 21

Whether the Euchariſt be nothing elſe but Chriſt; and to adore the Euchariſt be only to adore Chriſt. 22

VII. *Concexning Communion in both kinds. The words of Inſtitution a plain Scripture-proof of the neceſſity of it.* 24, 25

VIII. *Whether*

Page

VIII. *Whether Chastity deliberately vowed may be inoffensively violated: this proved not to be the Doctrine of the Church of* England. 26

The Article concerning the Marriage of Priests, in Edw. VI. *and Queen* Elizabeths *Reign, considered.* 27, 28

IX. *Whether all Christian Excellencies are commanded.* 29

That Gospel Exhortations include a Command. ibid.

That the heights and perfections of Vertue are commanded, and in what sense. 30

When you have done that is commanded you, say we are unprofitable Servants, proved to be a plain confutation of the Doctrine of Supererogation. 33

The meaning of this Question, Whether all Christian Excellencies are commanded in Scripture, and to what purpose it serves in the Church of Rome. 34

The meritorious works of the Church of Rome *are not commanded by God, nor are they any Christian Excellencies. Such as the Monkish Vows of Poverty, Cœlibacy, and absolute Obedience to Superiors.* 36

This showed particularly of the Vow of Poverty. ibid.

And Cœlibacy. 37

And Monkish Obedience, ibid. & 38

X. *Whether every Soul as soon as expired is conveyed to Heaven or Hell.* 39

Concerning Dives *and* Lazarus, *and S.* Paul's *desire to be dissolved, and to be with Christ.* ibid.

The Doctrine of the Council of Trent *concerning* Purgatory. 42

This more particularly explained from Cardinal Bellarmine. 43, 44

The design of it to acquaint our People, what proofs they must demand for Purgatory. 45

Page

A middle state between Death and Judgment, which is neither Heaven nor Hell, does not prove a Popish Purgatory. *ibid.*

The Primitive Fathers did believe a middle state. 46

The difference between this and a Popish Purgatory. *ib.*

1. *That this they affirmed of all separate Souls, That none were received into Heaven before the Resurrection. But* Purgatory *is not for all Souls, but for those only, who have not satisfied for their sins.* 47

2. *They affirm this separate state, not to be a state of Punishment, as the Popish* Purgatory *is, but of Joy and Felicity.* 48

3. *This is an unalterable state till the Day of Judgment, and therefore no Popish* Purgatory, *out of which Souls may be redeemed with Prayers and Alms.* 50

The Purgatory Fire which the Fathers speak of, does not prove a Popish Purgatory. 51

1. *Because that is not till the Day of Judgment.* 2. Austin's *Opinion of* Purgatory *Fire explained, and proved very different from the Popish* Purgatory. 52, &c.

2. *All Men, excepting Christ himself, were to pass through the last Fire, but the Popish* Purgatory *is not for all.* 56

3. *The Popish* Purgatory *Fire is not for Purgation, but the Fire at the Day of Judgment, according to the ancient Fathers, &c.* 57

Origen's *notion of a Purgatory Fire.* 58

4. *There is no Redemption out of this Fire by the Prayers and Alms of the living. Which is upon all accounts the most comfortable thing in a Popish* Purgatory. 60

The ancient Practice of Praying for Souls departed, does not prove a Popish Purgatory. 61

The

Page

The Original of this Practice of Praying for the Dead. ibid. *and* 62

The state of the Controversie between Aërius *and* Epiphanius. 63, &c.

For what reasons the ancient Christians prayed for the dead. 64, &c.

S. Austin's *account of the reasons of praying for the dead different from what the Fathers before him gave.* 67

The custom of praying to the Saints, which was then introduced, the occasion of this change. ibid.

S. Austin *first made three distinctions of Souls departed.* ibid.

And yet the Popish Purgatory cannot be proved from S. Austin. 68

S. Chrysostom's *opinion of this matter different from S.* Austin's. 71, &c.

XI. *Concerning the Intercessions of the Saints in Heaven for us.* 74

The distinction between a Mediator of Redemption and Intercession. 75

No sense in that distinction between a Mediator of Redemption and Intercession. 77

This distinction contrary to the Analogy both of the Old and New Testament. 78

The difference between the virtue of the Sacrifice, the Prayers of the People, and the Intercession of the Priest. 79

The difference between the prayers of good Men for themselves and one another, and the Intercession of a Mediator. 81

To flie to the Aid of Saints in Heaven derogates from the Intercession of Christ. 83

Praying to Saints in Heaven more injurious to God, than to a Mediator. 84

XII. *Concerning the worship paid to the Cross and Images.* 86

Whether

Page

Whether the worship they pay to the Cross and Images, be no more than what we give to the Bible. ibid.

The reasons why some Protestants have charged the worship of Images with Idolatry. 88

No alterations made in the Law against worshipping Images in the New Testament. 92

The reasons of the Second Commandment, Moral and Eternal. 93

No material Temple, much less an Image allowed under the Gospel. 95

The Primitive Church always understood the Worship of Images to be forbid under the Gospel. 99

XIII. *Whether the Pope be Antichrist, and whether this be taught in the Homilies of the Church of* England, ibid,

XIV. *Concerning Prayers and Divine Offices in the Vulgar tongue.* 101

The self-contradictions of this Author. 102

Whether S. Paul *in* 1 Cor. 14. *only forbid inspired and extempore prayers in an unknown tongue, not the setled forms of Divine Offices.* 104

All the Apostles arguments in that place against speaking in an unknown tongue concern our ordinary devotions. 105

As 1. *That it is contrary to the edification of the Church.* ib.

2. *That it contradicts the natural end and use of speech.* 106

3. *That it is contrary to the nature of Prayer and religious worship, which must be a reasonable Service.* 107

Whether the people are bound to joyn in all the offices of publick worship. 108

Whether the people understand their prayers, though they are in Latin, *which they do not understand.* 112

XV. *Concerning Schism and Separation.* 114

Separa-

Page

Separation from the Errors of the Church of Rome *is not a Separation from the Catholick Church.* 116

Renouncing the Supremacy of the Biſhop of Rome *no Schiſm.* ibid.

Such a ſupremacy not eſſential to Catholick Unity. 117

Concerning the Eccleſiaſtical combinations of neighbour Churches and Biſhops into one body. ibid.

In what caſes a particular Church may break off from ſuch a body. 118

The Popes Supremacy ſuch an uſurpation as may be renounced without the authority of a general Council. ibid.

The Church of England *not originally ſubject to the Biſhop of* Rome *as the Weſtern Patriarch.* 121

The difference between Schiſm from the Catholick Church, and the breach of Eccleſiaſtical Communion. 122

To reform errors and corruptions in Faith and Worſhip can never be a fault. 125

That the Church of England *does not ſeparate from all other Chriſtian Societies.* 126

Concerning Communion in the Euchariſt and other religious Aſſemblies. 129

What Church we joyned in Communion with, when we forſook the Communion of the Church of Rome. 130

What Church we made the pattern of our Reformation. 131

In what ſenſe the Church of Rome *her ſelf was the pattern of our Reformation.* 132

XVI. *Concerning the defection and apoſtaſie of the Clergy of the Catholick Church, and the Reformation of the Laity.* 134

Whether the whole Clergy were againſt the Reformation. 135

The Popiſh Clergy in the Reign of King Henry *the Eighth did own the King's Supremacy and wrote for it.* 136, &c.

We do not aſſert, That the Church of Rome *has apoſtatized from fundamental Truth and Holineſs.* 138

Whether all kind of Idolatry be an Apoſtaſie from fundamental Truth and Holineſs. 139

The

Page

The nature of that argument to prove, That a thing is not, because it cannot be, when there is all other possible evidence to prove, That it is. 140

As that the Church of Rome *has not erred, because she cannot err.* 141, &c.

If the Reformation be good, there can want no authority to reform. 147

The Supreme Authority of any Nation has a regular Authority to declare, what shall be the established Religion of that Nation, which is all that we attribute to Kings and Parliaments in such matters. 250

ERRATA.

PAG. 53. l. 4. for *now* r. *not*. p. 123. l. 33. r. *as shews*. p. 145. l. 14. dele *upon*.

Some faults there are in Pointing, which I must leave to the Reader to correct.

A VINDI-

A VINDICATION OF SEVERAL Protestant Doctrines: BEING AN ANSWER TO A LATE PAMPHLET ENTITULED, *Protestancy destitute of Scripture-Proofs.*

THAT I have taken so little an occasion to write so big a Book, I hope the Reader upon his perusal will pardon. There is indeed a remarkable difference between us and our Roman Adversaries in this matter; they can answer great Books in two or three Sheets, if they vouchsafe to give any answer at all, which they begin to be weary of: we answer two or three Sheets in large Books; but then we have very different ends in

writing too; *they* to make a ſhow of ſaying ſomewhat, to put by the blow by ſome few inſignificant cavils; *we*, not only to anſwer our Adverſaries, which might be done in very few words, but, to inſtruct our people, which requires a more particular Explication of the reaſons of things. But I ſhall make no Apology for my Book, till I hear that it wants it; for it may be ſome may think it, as much too little, as others too big.

He begins very regularly with the ſtate of the Controverſie between us, to prove ſixteen Proteſtant Tenets (as he calls them) by *plain Scripture*; *Scriptures, but ſo plain to us, for their Doctrines, as they require to be yielded them by the Catholique Church for hers.* What will be thought plain by them, is a very hard matter to gueſs, when it ſeems, the ſecond Commandment it ſelf is not thought by them a plain Scripture-proof againſt Image-worſhip, and I deſpair of ever finding a plainer proof in Scripture for or againſt any thing. But I told him in Anſwer to his requeſt (*p.* 17.) that we deſire no other proofs from them, but what we are ready to give, *either the expreſs words of Scripture, or plain and evident conſequence, or the ſilence of Scripture, to prove that any Doctrine is not in it.* And though they may reaſonably demand of us, what we demand of them, yet they cannot reaſonably demand more; and whether I have not done him juſtice in this way, ſhall be examined again under the ſeveral Articles of his requeſt. In the next Paragraph he mightily deſpiſes the Anſwer, and *concluded the pamphlet unworthy a publick or ſpecial notice, and expected, if not more pertinent, yet at leaſt more plauſible replies to follow*, and I can aſſure him, that he was very ill adviſed, that he did not deſpiſe and expect on; for his reply has given ſome credit and authority

thority to that Anſwer, and has now produced a Book, which if he be wiſe, he will deſpiſe too; though I hope it will convince him, that *Proteſtants do not mean to expoſe their profeſſion by ſilence*, which I do not find them much inclined to at preſent.

But let us conſider the ſtate of the queſtion. In anſwer to the Requeſt to prove ſome Proteſtant Tenets by plain Scripture, I told him this was a falſe repreſentation of our Doctrine; for though we do make the Scripture the rule of our Faith, yet we do not pretend to own no Doctrine, but what is contained in the expreſs words of Scripture. Our Church teaches us, Art. 6. that *Holy Scripture containeth all things neceſſary to Salvation; ſo that whatſoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any Man, that it ſhould be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requiſite or neceſſary to Salvation.* Where our Church diſtinguiſhes between what is *read in the Scripture*, that is, contained in expreſs words there, and what *may be proved thereby*, that is, by plain and neceſſary conſequence, from what is expreſly taught in Scripture; and yet confines ſuch Proof as this only *to Articles of Faith*, or what *is thought requiſite or neceſſary to Salvation.* And the true reaſon of this is, that the *Church of England* teaches *the ſufficiency of the Holy Scriptures to Salvation*, which is the very Title of this Article, and therefore all things neceſſary to be believed to Salvation muſt be contained in expreſs words in Scripture, or be proved thence by plain and evident conſequence; which ſhows, that we are not ſtrictly obliged to prove any thing from Scripture, but what we teach for an Article of Faith, or as neceſſary to Salvation. This is the reaſon, why we demand a Scripture-proof from the Church of *Rome* for the

Anſ. to requeſt, *p.* 1.

the new Articles of the *Trent* Faith; for if the belief of them be neceſſary to Salvation, as they ſay they are, then either the Scriptures do not contain all things neceſſary to Salvation, or they are bound to ſhow, where theſe Doctrines are contained in Scripture. For this reaſon the *Church of England*, which owns *the ſufficiency of the Scripture to Salvation*, rejects all thoſe Doctrines, which the *Church of Rome* without any Proof from Scripture teaches as neceſſary to Salvation; and this we think reaſon enough to reject them, that they are not contained in Scripture, which contains all things neceſſary to Salvation.

Now our Author, and ſome of his ſize, who don't ſee half a Conſequence before them, think they have a mighty advantage of us in demanding the ſame Proofs from us to juſtifie our rejecting their Doctrines, which we demand of them to juſtifie their belief of them: that is to ſay, as we demand of them a Scripture-Proof, that there is ſuch a place as Purgatory, they think, they may as reaſonably demand of us a Scripture-Proof, that there is no ſuch place as Purgatory; juſt with as much reaſon as if one ſhould tell me, that by the Laws of *England* every Man is bound to Marry at twenty years old, and when I deſire him to ſhow me the Law which makes this neceſſary, he ſhould anſwer, though he cannot ſhow ſuch a Law, yet it may be neceſſary, unleſs I can ſhow him a Law which expreſly declares, that it is not neceſſary: whereas nothing is neceſſary, but what the Law makes ſo; and if the Law has not made it neceſſary, there is no need of any Law to declare, that it is not neceſſary. Thus the Proteſtant Doctrine of the ſufficiency of Scriptures to Salvation, requires us to produce a plain Scripture-Proof for every thing, which we believe

neceſſary

neceſſary to Salvation; but it does not require a Scripture-Proof, that that is not neceſſary to Salvation, which the Scripture has not revealed nor made neceſſary to Salvation: for if the Scriptures contain all things neceſſary to Salvation, it is a ſufficient Proof, that ſuch Doctrines are not neceſſary to Salvation, which are not contained in the Scriptures: Unleſs we think, that the Scripture muſt beforehand confute all poſſible Hereſies, which might ariſe in the Church, and tell us particularly in all points, what we muſt not believe, as well as what we muſt.

This I obſerved was the caſe, as to thoſe Articles of the *Church of England*, which are oppoſed to the Corruptions and Innovations of the *Church of Rome*, that they are negative Articles, and a negative Article only rejects ſuch Doctrines from being Articles of Faith, as are not contained in Scripture, and it is ridiculous to demand a plain Scripture-Proof, that ſuch a Doctrine is not in Scripture. We believe it is not there, becauſe we cannot find it there, and thoſe who pretend it is there, cannot ſhow it there; which is proof enough, and all that the Subject is capable of.

This is what our Author attempts an Anſwer to in the preceding Paragraph, and firſt, he ſays, that *thoſe of the thirty nine Articles, which are oppoſed to Catholick Religion* (ſo he calls the Popiſh Corruptions of Chriſtianity) *contain Affirmative propoſitions, or may be reſolved into equivalent affirmatives.* What then? Is the diſpute about the terms wherein the Article is conceived, whether they be Negative or Affirmative? or about the reaſon, why

it is either affirmed or denied, *viz.* that ſuch a Doctrine is not taught in Scripture? for this is all I meant by a negative Article, that we deny ſuch a Doctrine to be contained in Scripture. Now ſuppoſe I ſhould ſay, There is no ſuch place as Purgatory, which is a negative Propoſition, or that Purgatory is a late and fond invention, which is affirmative, what difference is there between them? when they both reſolve into this, that Purgatory is not taught in Scripture; and therefore the queſtion is ſtill the ſame, whether the Article be expreſſed affirmatively or negatively, and no Man can be bound to prove by plain and expreſs Scripture, that Purgatory is not taught in Scripture.

Well! but *though for a Negative, or every non-aſſent or ſuſpence of aſſent, a reaſon may not be given or required, yet for belief, for a ſolemn profeſſion, ſubſcription and ſwearing of that belief (whether it be of negatives or affirmatives) a reaſon may be aſſigned and required.* What glorious and triumphant Nonſence is here? How does *a negative* Article and *non-aſſent* come to be the ſame thing? For we Proteſtants uſe to give our aſſent to negative Articles: And why are not Men bound to give a reaſon of their *non-aſſent*, as well as of their aſſent? And how are they more bound to give a reaſon of their profeſſion and ſwearing their *non-aſſent*, than they are of their bare *non-aſſent*? And who ever dreamt, that Men are not bound to give a reaſon of their *non-aſſent*, and of their profeſſion of *non-aſſent*? and laſtly, what is all this to the purpoſe of demanding expreſs Proofs of

of Scripture, that ſuch Doctrines, as ſuppoſe Purgatory, or the Invocation of Saints, *&c.* are not taught in Scripture? And why is it not a ſufficient reaſon of a *non-aſſent*, or declared and profeſſed denial of ſuch Doctrines, that it does not appear, that they are taught in Scripture?

But the *Requeſt*, he ſays, *propoſed only affirmatives*; and they have been conſidered and anſwered already, and his Defence ſhall be conſidered again without any *Feneing or Tergiverſation*.

But the *Thirty nine Articles* not only declare, *that the oppoſite affirmatives are not in Scripture (for they may not be there, and yet be true)* (but if they be not there, we cannot know they are true, much leſs can they be Articles of Faith, and neceſſary to Salvation) *but alſo that they are rather, and plainly repugnant to Scripture*; this I confeſs does require a Scripture-Proof, that a Doctrine is not only not in the Scripture, but repugnant to it; but then a plain and evident conſequence from ſomething elſe, which is taught in Scripture, is all the proof, which can be expected in ſuch caſes, and this we are ready to give, when our Author ſhall demand it. And now would not any one wonder, how from theſe premiſes he concludes, that he *has ſhewn Proteſtants obliged to give Scripture-reaſons for their belief of Negatives*; that is, if he will ſpeak to the purpoſe, that we are obliged to prove from plain and expreſs Texts of Scripture, that thoſe Doctrines which we reject as unſcriptural, are not contained in Scripture; we muſt prove from Scripture, that that is not in Scripture, which we ſay is not in it; which may be done indeed by a negative Argument, from the ſilence of Scripture about it, but is not capable of a direct and poſitive Proof.

Let us now take a review of his ſeveral Proteſtant Doctrines, for which he demands a Scripture-Proof, and ſee wherein the Anſwer was defective.

I. *Scripture is clear in all neceſſaries to every ſober Inquirer.*

In anſwer to this I obſerved, that every plain Text of Scripture proved its own plainneſs, and that as it needs no other Proof, no more than we need a proof, that the Sun ſhines, when we ſee it; ſo if we did not find it plain, no other argument or teſtimony could prove it to be plain: But this he takes no notice of, but only endeavours to weaken two Scripture teſtimonies, which, I ſaid, do by a very eaſie and natural Conſequence prove the plainneſs of Scripture; *for if the word of God be a light unto our feet, and a lamp unto our paths, then it muſt be clear, if light be clear,* Pſalm 119. 105. *if it be able to make men wiſe unto ſalvation,* 2 Tim. 3. 15. *then it muſt be plain and intelligible in all things neceſſary to ſalvation:* to which he anſwers, *that theſe Texts do not reach the propoſition to be proved: For if the word were a light to the Prophet* David's *feet, if all Scripture be given, that the Man of God may be perfect, yet a perſpicuity of Scripture in all neceſſaries to every ſober Inquirer, cannot be deduced thence, except every ſober Inquirer be a Prophet, or a Man of God, or at leaſt ſubject to ſuch:* As if none but Prophets or Apoſtles could underſtand the Scripture? But I thought light had been viſible to all Men, that have eyes in their Heads: and I am ſure the ſame Prophet tells us, *that the Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the Soul, the Teſtimony of the Lord is ſure, making wiſe the ſimple: the Statutes of the Lord are right, rejoycing the heart, the Commandment of the Lord is pure, enlighten-*

Anſwer to Requeſt, *p.* 2.

enlightning the eyes, Pſalm. 19. 7, 8. Is this ſpoken only of Prophets too? Are there no other ſouls to be converted, no other ſimple people to be made wiſe, no other hearts to be rejoyced, no other eyes to be enlightned, but only theirs? And when S. *Paul* tells *Timothy*, *from a Child thou haſt known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wiſe unto Salvation* (which was the place I cited) does this prove, that none but *a man of God* (for which he exchanges it, though that is not in the 15. but 17. verſe) can underſtand the Scriptures, when it ſeems, *Timothy underſtood* them, when he was a Child?

However thus much he muſt grant in his own way, that the Scriptures are very intelligible in all things neceſſary to Salvation; for otherwiſe *a man of God*, the Paſtors and Teachers of the Church, could not underſtand them, if they be not ſo plain, that they may be underſtood; and if the Scriptures be plain and intelligible in themſelves, then he muſt grant, that at leaſt all Men of Parts, and Learning, and Induſtry, who are ſober and honeſt Inquirers, may underſtand them as well as Divines, unleſs he will ſay, that Divines underſtand them not by the uſe of their reaſon and wiſe conſideration, but by Inſpiration and Prophecy; and then it is not the Scripture, but the inſpired interpretation of it, which makes Men wiſe unto Salvation. At leaſt he muſt grant, that the Scriptures can make any other *Man of God* perfect, as well as the Pope; for this is not ſpoke of S. *Peter* and his Succeſſors only, but of *Timothy*, and any other *Man of God*; and therefore there is no need, that all other Biſhops and Paſtors ſhould depend on the Pope, as an infallible Oracle.

Nay

Nay if the Scriptures are able to make *the man of God perfect* in the diſcharge of his Miniſtry, of which S. *Paul* here ſpeaks, *for Doctrine, for Reproof, for Correction, for Inſtruction in Righteouſneſs*, then the people alſo, who are to be taught, may be made to underſtand the Scriptures, the Doctrines, Reproofs, and Inſtructions of it; for as the Scripture is the Teachers Rule, ſo it is his Authority too; and if the people cannot be taught to underſtand the Scriptures in things neceſſary to Salvation, they cannot know, that ſuch things are in Scripture; which deſtroys the Divine Authority of the Preacher. For what he teaches without Scripture, can only have his own authority, or the authority of other Men like himſelf: and yet no Man can tell, whether what he teaches be in the Scripture, who cannot in ſome meaſure underſtand the Scripture himſelf; and if a Divine Faith muſt be founded upon the Authority of Scripture, which is the only Divine Authority we now have; and no Man can believe upon the Authority of Scripture, who cannot underſtand it; then it is as neceſſary, that all things neceſſary to Salvation ſhould be ſo plain in Scripture, that all perſons at leaſt with the help of a Guide, ſhould underſtand them; as it is, that all, even the meaneſt Men, ſhould know all things neceſſary to their Salvation.

For it is a Scandal to the Proteſtant profeſſion to ſay, that we reject the Authority of *Church Guides*, which we own as well as the *Church of Rome*; only with this difference, That the Church of *Rome* will have Men believe their Guides without reaſon or underſtanding; we have Guides not merely to dictate to us, but to teach us to underſtand. As the Maſters in other Arts and Sciences do; who explain the reaſons of things to

their

their Scholars, till they attain to a great Maſtery and perfection of knowledge themſelves: And if by the help of ſuch a Teaching, not an Impoſing, Guide, Men may underſtand the Scripture in all things neceſſary to Salvation, then the Scripture is plain and intelligible, though an unlearned Man cannot underſtand it without a Guide; as Mathematical demonſtrations are certainly plain, if any thing be plain, though unskilful Men cannot underſtand them without a Maſter; but that is clear and plain in it ſelf, which can be explained to every ordinary apprehenſion; and ſuch we aſſert the Scriptures to be in all neceſſaries. Learned Men can by their own ſtudies and inquiries underſtand the true ſenſe of them; and the Unlearned can be taught to underſtand them; and this is the uſe we make of our Guides, not to ſubmit our judgments to them without any underſtanding; but to inform our judgments, that we may be able to ſee and underſtand for our ſelves. Thus our Saviour taught his Diſciples, *he opened their underſtandings, that they might underſtand the Scriptures*; Thus the Apoſtles and Primitive Doctors inſtructed the World, by expounding the Scriptures to them, which does not ſignifie merely to tell them, what the ſenſe of Scripture is, and requiring them to believe it; but ſhowing them out of the Scriptures, that this is, and muſt be, the true ſenſe of it; and we need not fear, that Proteſtancy ſhould ſuffer any thing from ſuch Guides as theſe, though the Church of *Rome* indeed has felt the ill effects of them.

II. *The Secular Prince hath all ſpiritual juriſdiction and authority immediately from and under God.* F. Prot.

Here, he ſays, *I behave my ſelf, as if I were under apprehenſions, and durſt neither own nor reject this Tenet*, and yet in

Anſwer to Requeſt, *p.* 3.

in my Anſwer, I expreſly ſhow, what the *Church of England* means by the Kings Supremacy in Eccleſiaſtical Cauſes; *which ſignifies no more than that the King is Supreme in his own Dominions, and therefore there is no Power, neither Secular nor Eccleſiaſtick, above him; for if there were, he were not Supreme.* And this I ſaid might be proved from *Rom.* 13. 1. *Let every Soul be ſubject to the higher powers*: to which he anſwers, that *this proves more than I grant. It proves miniſtring the Word and Sacraments to belong to the Higher Powers.* How ſo? Yes this it does, *unleſs miniſtring the Word and Sacraments be not a ſoul affair, be no act of power.* Learnedly obſerved! becauſe *every ſoul* muſt be ſubject to the Higher Powers, therefore the King has all Power *in ſoul-affairs*, and therefore *of miniſtring the Word and Sacraments*: But if *every ſoul* only ſignifie every Man (without excepting the Pope himſelf) then I ſuppoſe all Eccleſiaſticks as well as Secular perſons are included in it; and if all muſt be ſubject to the King, then the King is Supreme over all; but things are at a low ebb in the *Church of Rome*, when ſuch ſilly Quibbles muſt paſs for Arguments.

III. *Juſtification by Faith alone* (viz. *a perſuaſion that we are juſtified*) *is a wholſome Doctrine.*

In anſwer to this I denied, that *our Church teaches, that juſtifying Faith is a perſuaſion, that we are juſtified.* He grants, that ſome of the *Church of England* have condemned it (*p.* 4.) but yet he may as juſtly charge us with it, as we charge the *Church of Rome* with Doctrines contrary to their General Councils, and conſtant Profeſſion; and we grant he may, for if ſuch things be done, they are very unjuſt both in him and us; we deny, that we do any ſuch thing, and have lately abundantly

dantly vindicated our ſelves from ſuch an imputation; let him do as much for himſelf if he can. But *Cranmer* was of this mind, *by whom the Articles were deviſed*; But how does that appear? and if he were, what is that to us, when there is no ſuch thing in our Articles? will he allow the Council of *Trent* to be expounded according to the Private opinions of every Biſhop, that was in it? *The* Antinomians *plead the Doctrine of the eleventh Article, as the Parent of their irreligion*, and ſo they do the Scriptures: And what then? Will he hence infer, that the Scriptures countenance *Antinomianiſm*, becauſe they alledge Scripture for it? And why then muſt this be charged upon our Articles? Though what ſome may have done, I cannot tell, but *Antinomians* don't uſe to trouble themſelves with our Articles. *But the ſtricteſt Adherers to the Primitive Reformers in Doctrine (the Puritans) aſſert this Solifidian Parentheſis, as the genuine and literal ſenſe of Juſtification by Faith alone, and of the eleventh Article:* Why the *Puritans the ſtricteſt Adherers to the Primitive Reformers in Doctrine?* but we need not ask a reaſon of his ſayings, who underſtands nothing about what he ſpeaks: For the Puritans did not and do not believe, *That juſtifying Faith is a perſuaſion, that we are juſtified*, but they place juſtifying Faith in an act of recumbency on Chriſt for Salvation, and diſpute vehemently againſt his Notion of it. But, he ſays, *I might have given them a Text aſſerting, what I confeſs our Church teaches*, viz. *that juſtification by Faith only is a wholeſome Doctrine, and very full of comfort, which intimates no neceſſity of repentance*

pentance to Juſtification, none of the Sacraments. Yes it does, and of good works too, as the conditions of our Juſtification, though not as the meritorious cauſes of it; for all this our Church comprehends in the notion of *a living Faith*, which alone juſtifies; and then I ſuppoſe as many Texts as there are, which attribute our Juſtification to Faith, ſo many proofs there are, that Juſtification by Faith alone, as oppoſed to all Meritorious Works, is a wholeſome Doctrine, and very full of comfort.

IV. *The ſubſtance of Bread and Wine remains after, what it was before, ſacerdotal Conſecration.*

Here he takes no notice of any one word, which I returned in Anſwer: The ſum of which is, that the material ſubſtance before and after Conſecration is the ſame, that is, that they are Bread and Wine ſtill, but by vertue of Chriſt's Inſtitution, after Conſecration they are not mere Bread and Wine, but a Sacrament of our Redemption by Chriſt's Death, and to ſuch as rightly and worthily, and by Faith receive the ſame, *the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Chriſt, and likewiſe the cup of bleſſing is a partaking of the Blood of Chriſt*, as our Church teaches: And this I proved muſt be the ſenſe of the words of Inſtitution, *This is my Body*, and urged ſuch arguments for it in ſhort, as he durſt not name again, much leſs pretend to Anſwer; but inſtead of that he endeavours to prove (*p.* 5.) that the words of Inſtitution, *This is my Body literally underſtood*, do *expreſly* prove, *that the ſubſtance of Bread does not remain*

remain at all after Conſecration: For the Euchariſt is Chriſt's Body and Blood, which if ſubſtantially Bread and Wine, it cannot really be. A change leſs than that of the ſubſtance of the Elements, is inſufficient to render them really and truly, what the Text ſays they are, after Conſecration.

But did not I give him my reaſons, why theſe words could not be underſtood *literally* of the natural Body and Blood of Chriſt? And is it enough then for him to ſay, that in a literal ſenſe, they muſt ſignifie a ſubſtantial change of the Bread and Wine into Chriſt's natural Body and Blood, without anſwering, what I urged againſt it? and yet in a literal ſenſe it cannot ſignifie ſo: For if *This* refers to the Bread, which our Saviour took, and bleſſed and brake, (and it can refer to nothing elſe) then the literal ſenſe of the words is, *This Bread is my Body*; and if Bread be the Body of Chriſt, then the ſubſtance of the Bread cannot be changed, for Bread cannot be the Body of Chriſt, if it be not Bread. Let him chooſe, which he will, either *This* ſignifies this Bread, or it does not: If it does, then the Bread cannot be ſubſtantially changed; for the Bread is the Body of Chriſt, and therefore is Bread ſtill, is Bread and the Body of Chriſt too; if it does not, then how does he prove, that the words of Conſecration in a literal ſenſe, tranſubſtantiate the Bread into the Body of Chriſt? For *This* does not ſignifie the Bread, and therefore *This is my Body* cannot ſignifie, that the ſubſtance of Bread is tranſubſtantiated into Chriſt's Body. I wonder our Author is not aſhamed at this time of day to talk at this rate, after ſo

many excellent Books as have been written upon this Argument; to ſave my ſelf any farther trouble, I ſhall direct my Reader to the late *Dialogues about the* Trinity *and Tranſubſtantiation, and the Diſcourſe of the Holy Euchariſt in the two great points of the Real Preſence and the Adoration of the Hoſt*; where he will find abundant ſatisfaction alſo to the two next Points, which follow.

V. *Our Lord's Preſence in the Euchariſt is merely gracious and influential, and if more, only to the faithful.*

In anſwer to this I ſhewed him, what we meant by Chriſt's Preſence in the Euchariſt, *that he is ſo preſent, that his Body and Blood, with all the benefits of his Death and Paſſion, are exhibited to worthy Receivers, as much as he could have been had we eat his natural Fleſh and drank his Blood*, which is ſomewhat more than the mere influences of his Grace: but, he ſaies, *I aſſert our Lords Euchariſtical Preſence not to be ſubſtantial*, that is, I ſuppoſe, that the natural ſubſtance of his Body is not there, and therefore that he is not corporally preſent, and this indeed I do aſſert. *Therefore* (ſays he) *unleſs intirely abſent, our Lord muſt be preſent in the Euchariſt by grace and influence only: what is there beſides ſubſtance and efficacy belonging to our Saviour's Body and Blood? no colour of Scripture is produced for this* Zuinglian *propoſition.*

Anſwer to Requeſt. *p.* 5.

If he will allow no *medium* between Chriſt's Corporal and Subſtantial Preſence, and his Grace and Influence; ſince it is demonſtrable, that he is not

not corporally preſent, we muſt in this ſenſe allow, that he is preſent *only* by his Grace and Influence, as that is oppoſed to a corporal preſence. And all Men muſt allow this, who deny Tranſubſtantiation, or Conſubſtantiation. But *what is there beſides Subſtance and Efficacy belonging to our Saviour's Body and Blood?* I anſwer, there can be nothing naturally belonging to any Body beſides its ſubſtance, and natural vertues and powers, which he calls its *Efficacy*; but by Inſtitution there may; and we take the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be an Inſtitution, and therefore not to have a natural, but inſtituted Vertue and Efficacy. For the very notion of an Inſtitution is, that all the Vertues and Efficacy of it is not owing to Nature, but to the Will and Appointment of God. Whatever is a natural power, is no Inſtitution, no Sacrament; for the effect there is wholly owing to Nature, not to God's appointment, which acts by a Power and Influence ſuperior to Nature. Which, I think, is little leſs than a demonſtration, that the natural Body and Blood of Chriſt is not ſubſtantially preſent in the Euchariſt; for whatever Efficacy and Vertue we attribute to eating the Fleſh and drinking the Blood of Chriſt, it is either a natural effect of this eating the Body and drinking the Blood of Chriſt, or it is not. If it be, then it is no Sacrament, which works not by the powers of Nature, but of Inſtitution. If it be not, what need is there of Chriſt's bodily preſence in the Sacrament? when a Sacramental Body of Chriſt, conſecrated Bread and Wine, to repreſent and exhibit his broken Body and his Blood

ſhed

ſhed for us, by vertue of an Inſtitution, may be as effectual to all the ends and purpoſes of a Sacrament, as his natural Body could be; which can have no Sacramental Efficacy, but by vertue of an Inſtitution.

The benefits we expect from this Sacramental feeding on Chriſt's Body, is an intereſt in the merits of his Death and Paſſion, *viz.* the forgiveneſs of our ſins, the communications of his Grace and Spirit, and a right to immortal life. Now I would deſire to know, whether theſe are the natural effects of a corporal eating Chriſt's natural Body? He purchaſed all this for us indeed by his Death and Paſſion; but is pardon of ſin, which is God's free and gracious act, incorporated with Chriſt's natural Body? and will a corporal eating of his Body communicate it to us? Do the communications of Grace and Spiritual life flow from the Body, or from the Spirit of Chriſt? Is it the contact of his Body, that makes our bodies immortal, or the inhabitation of his Spirit in us? What is that *Efficacy* then, which he attributes to Chriſt's natural Body, and ſuppoſes to be inherent in it? A natural efficacy, ſuch as can belong to human bodies, ſignifies nothing to the purpoſes of a Sacrament, and there can be no other efficacy inherent in Chriſt's natural Body; unleſs he will ſay, that pardon of Sin, and Spiritual Grace, and a power of making other bodies immortal, are the inherent and eſſential properties of Chriſt's Body.

But ſuppoſe it were ſo; how can the mere preſence of Chriſt's Natural Body in the Sacrament, which

which we neither ſee, nor touch, nor eat, communicate all theſe divine vertues to us? For if it be by Natural Communication, it muſt be by contact; for Bodies have no other way of working upon each other; and yet they will not allow, that we touch the Body of Chriſt, no more than that we ſee it; or that we break it between our Teeth, or chew it, or digeſt it in our Stomachs, that is, they will not allow, that we naturally eat it; and then how can it naturally communicate its vertues to us?

So that though the Natural Body of Chriſt were preſent in the Sacrament, thoſe divine Graces we expect from it, muſt be the effects of a Sacramental Inſtitution, not of Nature; and therefore the Natural preſence of Chriſt's Body is of no uſe in the Sacrament; for God may as well annex all the benefits of his Death and Paſſion to the Sacramental ſigns of his Body and Blood, as to his Natural Body; and the Power and Efficacy of the Inſtitution will be the ſame either way. And when the natural preſence of Chriſt's Body in the Euchariſt is ſo abſolutely impoſſible, ſuch a contradiction to the ſenſe and reaſon of Mankind, and of no uſe to the purpoſes of a Sacrament, but what may as well be otherwiſe ſupplied; and the Sacramental eating of Chriſt's Body in efficacious ſigns is ſo eaſie and intelligible, and by the power of an Inſtitution equally effectual, and ſo agreeable to the Nature of all other Inſtitutions and Sacraments both of the Old and New Teſtament, what ſhould incline Men to expound thoſe words of our Saviour, This is my Body, of his Natural

Natural Body, contrary to all the Sacramental forms of ſpeech uſed in Scripture, did they not think it meritorious to believe impoſſibilities and contradictions.

To return then a more direct Anſwer to our Author's queſtion, *what there is beſides Subſtance and Efficacy belonging to our Saviour's Body?* I anſwer, by Nature there is nothing elſe, but by Inſtitution there is; for there is the Sacrament of the Lord's Body, which is neither the natural Subſtance, nor the natural Efficacy of his Body, but a Sacramental Communion in the merits and Efficacy of his Death and Paſſion, which is a ſpiritual eating the Fleſh and drinking the Blood of Chriſt. And ſince he wants Scripture for this, I will give him a very plain Text, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. *The cup of Bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Chriſt? the Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Chriſt.* Thus S. *Paul* explains, what our Saviour ſaid, This is my Body, and, This is my Blood, by this is the Communion of Chriſt's Body and Blood: That is, that thoſe, who by Faith partake of the Sacramental Bread and Wine, do communicate in the Body and Blood of Chriſt.

This is a different thing from the mere influences of his Grace; for it is our intereſt and Communion in his Sacrifice, which is the meritorious cauſe and ſpring of all Divine Influences and Communications: We muſt be myſtically and ſpiritually united to Chriſt to have Communion in the Sacrifice of his Body and Blood, and then we receive the freſh ſupplies of Grace from him, which

which are the purchace of his Death, and the effect of our Union to him; and this Communion with the Body and Blood of Christ, we receive in the Lord's Supper, which is instituted by Christ, for that very purpose, and therefore it is called the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ; because it is the Sacrament of our Union to him, whereby we communicate in his Body and Blood; and if this be *Zuinglianism*, I see no help for it, but we must be contented to be *Zuinglians*.

VI. *Adoration of the Eucharist,* (i.e. *of our Saviour under the species of Bread and Wine*) *is Idolatry.*

I answered; *There was no such proposition as this taught in the Church of* England. *We teach indeed, that Bread and Wine in the Eucharist remains Bread and Wine after Consecration, and that to adore Bread and Wine is Idolatry. To adore our Saviour is no Idolatry, but to adore Bread and Wine for our Saviour may be as much Idolatry, as to worship the Sun for God.*

Instead of answering this he tells us, *This blasphemous Tenet is taught by our Church*, and which is a little worse, is practised by theirs. *For the majority of our pretended Bishops did Vote for the Test, and do all of them take it*, and I hope will keep it too. *That it is a Canon of our General Council, the Parliament*; and therefore it is very good Law, and that is all we desire for our Religion from Parliaments, and thank God that we have it; and since they are

a General Council, may they inſiſt upon their Infallibility. But what is the matter with the Teſt? Why, *it declares our Adoration of the Euchariſt (which is the Adoration of nothing but Jeſus Chriſt) to be Idolatry.* Is the Euchariſt then nothing but Jeſus Chriſt? does the Council of *Trent* ſay ſo? Is this the Doctrine of any of their Schoolmen, Canoniſts, or Divines? Nay, will this Author venture to ſay, that the Euchariſt is nothing but Jeſus Chriſt himſelf? Which is ſpeck and ſpan *New Popery*, if this be the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*. No! he does not, dares not, ſay, that the Euchariſt is nothing, but Jeſus Chriſt; but he ſays, that *the Adoration of the Euchariſt, is the Adoration of nothing but Jeſus Chriſt.* But what palpable nonſence is this; For if the Euchariſt be ſomething, which is not Jeſus Chriſt, then the Adoration of the Euchariſt muſt be the Adoration of ſomething, which is not Jeſus Chriſt. And yet though we ſhould ſuppoſe the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation to be true, yet the natural Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, according to the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, though it be preſent in the Sacrament, is not the Sacrament. For there can be no Sacrament of the Euchariſt without the ſpecies of Bread and Wine: and yet the Council of *Trent* decrees, that the worſhip of *Latria*, which is due to the true God, be given to this moſt Holy Sacrament: And that we might know, what they meant by the Sacrament, they tell us, it is that, which is inſtituted

Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 7. de Euchariſtia cap. 5.

tuted by Chriſt, to be received or eaten, which certainly is the ſpecies of Bread and Wine: For they being ſenſible, how abſurd it is to worſhip, what we eat, to prevent this, they tell us, that it is nevertheleſs to be adored, becauſe it is inſtituted to be received, or eaten. The reaſon indeed they give for it is, becauſe Chriſt is preſent in this Sacrament; but though the preſence of Chriſt be the reaſon of this Adoration, yet the whole Sacrament is the object, which is not merely the natural Body and Blood of Chriſt, but the ſpecies of Bread and Wine, under which is contained the Body and Blood of Chriſt; and therefore to adore the Sacrament is not to adore *nothing but Jeſus Chriſt*, for the Sacrament is ſomewhat more.

But then if the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation be falſe, they have no other object of their worſhip but Bread and Wine; and thus the Church of *England* believes, and thus our *General Council the Parliament*, which made the Teſt, believed, and thus all Men, who dare truſt their own Senſes, and Reaſon, believe; and if it be blaſphemy to teach, that the worſhip of Bread and Wine is Idolatry, ſome of the moſt Learned Divines of the *Church of Rome* have been guilty of this Blaſphemy, and I ſhould be glad to hear, what our Authors opinion is of it.

VII. *All Chriſtians, whenever they communicate, are obliged to receive in both kinds.*

Anſwer to Requeſt, *p.* 7.

For this I urged the expreſs words of inſtitution, which do as expreſly command us to drink of the Cup, as to eat of the Bread; ſo that if there be any command in Scripture to receive the Bread, there is the ſame command to receive the Cup: nay indeed as if our Saviour had purpoſely intended to prevent this Sacrilegious taking away of the Cup from the People; whereas in delivering the Bread, he only ſays, Take, Eat; when he bleſſed and delivered the Cup, he expreſly commanded, *Drink ye all of it.* And I further argued from the nature of the Euchariſt, which as it was inſtituted in both kinds, ſo it is not a compleat Sacrament without it: and yet our Author rubs his forehead and confidently tells his Readers; *Nor for this point can a Scripture command be diſcovered in the Anſwer. Though the thirtieth Article affirms, that both parts of the Lords Sacrament, by Chriſt's ordinance and commandment, ought to be miniſtred to all Chriſtian Men alike*: what he means by this I cannot gueſs; for if he will not allow an expreſs inſtitution, to be a Scripture-Proof; I deſpair of ever finding a Scripture-Proof for any thing; unleſs he can tell me, what proof there can be of an inſtitution, but the words of Inſtitution: does this Inſtitution then contain a command to receive the Euchariſt? if it does not, how does he prove,

prove, that all Chriſtians are bound to receive the Euchariſt? if it does, then *Take, Eat*; is a command to receive the Bread: and by the ſame reaſon, *Drink ye all of this*, is a command to all to receive the Cup; and both theſe being a part of the ſame Feaſt, and commanded at the ſame time; our Church had reaſon to ſay, that both *parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Chriſt's ordinance and commandment, ought to be adminiſtred to all Chriſtian Men alike.* The Church of *Rome* thinks the words of Inſtitution a plain and neceſſary command to conſecrate in both kinds, without which they grant it is not a Sacrament; now what other command have they for conſecrating, than we have for receiving in both kinds? the words of Inſtitution are all that we have about this matter; and let them give me reaſon, how the ſame words come to ſignifie conſecration, but not receiving, in both kinds? nay they grant that the Prieſt who conſecrates muſt receive as well as conſecrate in both kinds; and yet the Inſtitution is in the ſame form of words, without making any diſtinction between the Prieſt and the People; and how the ſame words ſhould command the Prieſt to receive in both kinds, and not the People, is ſomewhat myſterious. I am apt to think, that the Fathers of the Council of *Conſtance*, who decreed the communion in one kind with a *non obſtante* to our Saviour's Inſtitution, did ſuſpect, that there was a Scripture-Proof for communion in both kinds, or there had been no need to have made an exception.

Concil. *Conſtant.* Seſſ. 13.

ception to our Saviour's Inſtitution, and to have ſet up the authority of the Church againſt it. The Church of *Rome* allows, that it is lawful for the People to communicate in both kinds, and have reſerved this authority of granting ſuch a liberty to the Pope, now how can it be lawful, unleſs Chriſt has allowed it, and where has he allowed it, unleſs in the words of inſtitution; and they prove more than allowance, even a command; if, *Drink ye all of this*, be of the *Imperative Mood.*

VIII. *Chaſtity deliberately vowed may be inoffenſively violated.*

This, I ſaid, *is no Doctrine of our Church, nor are Proteſtants now concerned in it, though ſome of the Monks and Nuns at the beginning of the Reformation were:* and though I did not undertake a juſt defence of the Marriages of ſuch devoted perſons, yet I offered ſeveral things in Apology for them; and ſaid ſo much, that our Author did not think fit to make any reply to it, but only anſwers to my denial, that this is a Doctrine of our Church: He ſays, *This propoſition is a Doctrine of the Anſwerers Church, except his be not the ſame Church with* Edward *the Sixths, or the thirty ſecond Article have another ſenſe, than when compoſed by* Cranmer: *For all Biſhops and Prieſts then in the* Weſtern *Church had deliberately vowed chaſtity, and the Article ſays, It is lawful for them to marry, which certainly violates their vow.*

vow. No Scripture is alledged juſtifying a Tenet, ſo impure, ſo perfidious.

Thus by conſequence he proves, that it is the Doctrine of our Church, *that chaſtity deliberately vowed may be inoffenſively violated*; becauſe in K. *Edward* the Sixth and Archbiſhop *Cranmer*'s days, it was the Doctrine of this Church, that the Biſhops and Prieſts then in being, who had deliberately vowed chaſtity, might notwithſtanding marry. But ſuppoſe this was not the Doctrine in King *Edward*'s days, what becomes then of his conſequence? and yet this is the truth of the caſe. For the Article then only taught, that *Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons, are not commanded to vow the ſtate of ſingle life without marriage, neither by God's Law are they compelled to abſtain from Matrimony*: but there is not one word, whether thoſe, who were Biſhops and Prieſts at that time, and were under the vow of Cœlibacy (though every Prieſt, as a Prieſt, was not by the Laws of this Church, bound to undertake ſuch a vow, though they were forbid by the Canons to marry) might marry or not. For though the Article aſſerts, that they were not compelled by God's Law, to abſtain from Matrimony; yet it does not ſay, that they could not debar themſelves this liberty by voluntary vows; or that if they had done ſo, they might inoffenſively break thoſe vows, which is a very different queſtion. Indeed in Queen *Elizabeth*s Reign in the Convocation held at *London*, 1562. this Article is enlarged. *Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons*

Deacons, are not commanded by God's Law either to vow the eſtate of ſingle life, or to abſtain from marriage. Therefore it is lawful alſo for them, as for all other Chriſtian Men, to marry at their own diſcretion, as they ſhall judge the ſame to ſerve better to godlineſs. But this Article does not ſay, that thoſe Biſhops and Prieſts, who were entangled with a vow of Cœlibacy might lawfully marry, but only their being Biſhops and Prieſts was no hindrance to their Marriage: Whether there was any other impediment, it concerned them to conſider; but theſe obligations of Vows, which any of them were then under, being a perſonal thing; the preſent deciſion of that Controverſie was not thought fit to be made an Article of Religion. So that though ſome particular Perſons were at that time concerned in this queſtion, yet the Doctrine of our Church, never was concerned in it; for there never was any Synodical definition of it; and therefore there is no need of producing Scripture-Proofs for it. But yet notwithſtanding this, I am far from condemning thoſe Biſhops and Prieſts, and Nuns, and Friers, who did then marry; for I am ſure a chaſt Marriage is more acceptable to God, than an impure Cœlibacy: and thoſe Abominations which were diſcovered at the Diſſolution of Monaſteries, were enough to make Men abhor ſuch vows of Chaſtity, as he calls them: and I am very much of the opinion, that it were ſtill better for Prieſts to marry, than to debauch their Penitents or Converts. Thus much for his *impure and perfidious Tenet.*

IX.

IX. *All Chriſtian excellencies are commanded.*

This, I told him, I thought S. *Paul* had determined, *Philip.* 4. 8. *Whatſoever things are true, whatſoever things are honeſt*, &c. *think on theſe things. For if theſe general expreſſions do not comprehend all Chriſtian excellencies, I know not what does.* To this he anſwers, *Unleſs beſides comprehending, it command them, that Scripture will not prove the Tenet.* And *the mode of expreſſion* (that is, its being in the *Imperative Mood, Think on theſe things*) does not prove it to be a command, *becauſe it is common to an exhortation as well as precept.* Suppoſe this, then at leaſt it may be a Command, as well as an Exhortation, and he can never prove, that it is not a Command, and therefore can never confute any Man, who ſays it is a Command. But ſuppoſe it be an Exhortation; I thought that the Exhortations of the Goſpel, had always included a Command; and I deſire one inſtance of any Exhortation in Scripture, which relates to things neceſſarily good or evil, which does not include a Command. Indeed the ſtile of the Goſpel does not run in the form of Laws, but of exhortatory Commands, enforced with Reaſons and Arguments to perſwade; and it is an effectual way to baffle all the Precepts of the Goſpel, if ſuch Exhortations as are made in common to all Chriſtians, have not the force of a Command.

But I obſerved farther, *That whatever Virtues are commanded, we muſt always reckon, that the heights and perfections of thoſe Virtues are commanded, for God can command nothing leſs than a perfect Vertue*; and if this be true, then all Chriſtian Excellencies muſt be commanded; unleſs they be ſuch Excellencies as are no Vertues, which I fear may be the caſe. All Chriſtian Virtues are commanded in Scripture, without any bounds or limitations ſet to our duty; and I always thought, that Juſtice, and Goodneſs, and Charity, Meekneſs and Humility, Temperance and Chaſtity, the Love of God and Men, did ſignifie perfect Virtues, and a perfect Virtue muſt be perfect in degrees, as well as in its kind; and the Goſpel is ſo far from limiting our duty, that it makes the Divine nature it ſelf our pattern and example. That we muſt be *followers of God*, μιμηται, Imitators of God, *like dear Children.* And that we muſt *be perfect as our Father, which is in Heaven, is perfect*; which advances our duty to the utmoſt poſſible attainments in Virtue.

But then I added, that the attainment of the higheſt perfections in Virtue is not made the neceſſary condition of our Salvation. Though a perfect Virtue be commanded, yet for Chriſt's ſake a ſincere, though imperfect, obedience ſhall be accepted. But the more perfect and excellent Virtue ſhall have the more perfect and excellent reward; which is reaſon enough for us to aſpire after the greateſt perfections. And yet thoſe degrees

grees of perfection, which we are bound to attain to, muſt bear ſome proportion to what we have received from God. For *to whom much is given, of them ſhall be much required.* Which ſhows, that ſuch attainments as bear proportion to our receipts, ſhall be exacted from us as a juſt debt; which may make different degrees of Virtue in different Men matter of ſtrict duty.

This, our Author ſays, *imports, that proportion, not equality muſt be in our accounts to our abilities.* This I do not well underſtand; for an equal proportion is an equality. But this, he ſays, *does not agree with this Doctrine, that we muſt always reckon the heights and perfections of Virtues are commanded.* His reaſon for it is this: *The Account correſponds to our Abilities (ſo ſure does the Command) but all Abilities are not the ſame in all; how then can God's Commands be ſo to all, as they are, if he always enjoyns the heights and perfections of Virtues?*

The Account, he ſays, correſponds with our Abilities, and therefore the Command muſt: but how does he prove this. God will accept of us, according to our Abilities, which is an act of Grace and Favour, and owing to the Merits and Interceſſion of Chriſt; and therefore his Commands too, which are the Eternal and Unalterable Rules of Righteouſneſs, muſt be proportioned to our Abilities: as if God might not in Grace and Mercy accept of leſs, than in Juſtice he can require; or as if it became a Holy and per-

fect Being to Command leſs, than a perfect Virtue.

But all Abilities are not the ſame, how then can God's Commands be ſo to all? that is, the ſame to all Men. And are not his Commands the ſame to all Men? Do his Commands differ, as Mens Abilities do? How many ſeveral Goſpels, and ſeveral Laws, then muſt we have? And where do we find theſe ſeveral Commands proportioned to Mens ſeveral Abilities? We have but one Goſpel, that I know of, and the Laws of it, are the ſame to all; and it is neceſſary it ſhould be ſo; that all Men may know, that they are bound to be as good as they can; and not abſolve themſelves from any degrees of Virtue, as above their Abilities; and therefore not Commanded them by God: This is what God will do himſelf, when he comes to judge the World; He will mercifully conſider, whether Men have done, what they could, and will accept of a little, when it is their beſt; but we muſt know, that it is our duty to do all the good we can, and therefore that the Law requires the moſt perfect Virtue; which will engage us to do our beſt, and uſe our utmoſt endeavours to pleaſe God; and then depend on his Grace to accept our ſincere endeavours inſtead of perfection.

Had I indeed ſaid, That God had made the heights and perfections of Virtue abſolutely neceſſary to the Salvation of all Men, then he might have confuted me from our Saviour's Rule of proportion, *To whom much is given, of them ſhall*

ſhall be much required: but this I expreſly denied, *that every Man ſhould be damned, who does not attain to the higheſt perfections.* And expreſly affirmed, *That a ſincere Chriſtian ſhall be ſaved, notwithſtanding his many defects, but our reward ſhall be proportioned to our ſeveral degrees and attainments in Virtue.* That the moſt perfect Virtue ſhall have the moſt exeellent reward. And this is enough to confound the pretence of Merit, and works of ſupererogation; eſpecially that ſenſleſs Doctrine of one Man's meriting for another; which is the foundation of Popiſh Indulgences. For if the moſt perfect Virtue be matter of Duty, and under Command, how is it poſſible, that any Man can do more than his Duty? unleſs he can do ſomething better than the beſt. And if our reward be proportioned to our beſt actions, what redundancy of Merits can there be, when all the good we do, is ſo amply rewarded?

Thus, I obſerved, our Church confuted the Popiſh Doctrine of Supererogation, from what our Saviour tells his Diſciples, *When ye have done all, that are commanded to you, ſay we are unprofitable ſervants.* To this our Author anſwers, *If to ſupererogate did ſignifie (with Catholicks) to profit God, then the fourteenth Article (condemning the Teachers of works of Supererogation, of Arrogance and Impiety) had been ſolidly founded on, When you have done all that are commanded to you, ſay we are unprofitable ſervants. But we meaning no ſuch thing, the Article perverts Scripture.* This is an admirable anſwer, which does ſomewhat more than

than *pervert*, for it ridicules the Text. For might not the Diſciples have anſwered our Saviour, as this Diſputer does, we are not ſo ſilly, as to think, we can profit God, but yet we may ſupererogate, and deſerve ſome thanks from him. It is true, God being infinitely happy and perfect in himſelf, we can make no addition to him, and therefore cannot in a ſtrict ſenſe profit him; nor therefore could our Saviour underſtand it in this ſenſe; but as that Servant may be ſaid to profit his Maſter, and to deſerve thanks, who does more than is his duty, ſo might we be ſaid to be profitable Servants, could we alſo ſupererogate, or do more than is our duty; and here our Saviour's argument lies; that when we have done all that is commanded us, all the good, that we can poſſibly do, yet we muſt confeſs our ſelves unprofitable Servants, becauſe we have done nothing, but what was our duty: and if the Apoſtles themſelves did, and could do, no more than was their duty, I think our Church might very well charge theſe Teachers of works of Supererogation with Arrogance and Impiety; if to advance themſelves above the Apoſtles be Arrogance, and to make God a debtor to them be Impiety.

But that our People may a little underſtand the weight and moment of this Controverſie, it will be neceſſary briefly to unriddle it.

Of what conſequence the Doctrine of Purgatory is in the *Church of Rome*, is ſufficiently known; for a Church, which can perſwade People, that without

without her help, they muſt be damned for ſome hundred or thouſand Years (for Purgatory is nothing elſe but a Temporal Damnation, as Hell is Eternal, which is the only difference between them) muſt needs have a great authority over all ſorts of perſons, who are conſcious to themſelves, that they do not live ſo innocently as to be out of danger of Purgatory: But the Doctrine of Purgatory it ſelf could do the Church no ſervice, had ſhe not the power of Indulgence to remit the pains of Purgatory; and yet Indulgences are owing to the ſtock of Merits, which the Church has the keeping and diſpoſal of; and yet there can be no Merits without ſome works of *Supererogation*, and there can be no Works of *Supererogation*, if no Man can do more than what is commanded, than what is his duty to do: For when we do no more than our duty, we muſt confeſs our ſelves to be unprofitable Servants, as that is oppoſed to Merit: For no Man merits merely by doing his duty. And this occaſions this Diſpute, whether all Chriſtian excellencies are commanded; for if we can do no good thing, but what is commanded, there is no room left for Merits nor Works of *Supererogation*; and then there can be no ſtock of Merits to be the Fund of Indulgences, and then Purgatory will be ſo uncomfortable a Doctrine, that no Man will truſt to it, but will think it his intereſt to live vertuouſly, that he may eſcape both Hell and Purgatory, and go to Heaven when he dies; and then the *Church of Rome* will loſe her Authority, and her gainful Trade together.

This

This is the plain ſtate of the caſe; and therefore to do the *Church of Rome* Right, ſhe principally attributes Merit to ſuch good Works, as ſhe calls them, which God has no where commanded; but whether theſe be Chriſtian excellencies or no, would be conſidered. The Monkiſh vows of Poverty, Cœlibacy, and abſolute Obedience to their Superiors, are thought a ſtate of Perfection and Merit; and if they be ſo, theſe are works of *Supererogation* indeed, for they are no where commanded by God; but I confeſs, I cannot underſtand the excellency of them, eſpecially not as practiſed in the *Church of Rome.*

It is an argument of a great and excellent mind to live above this World, and to deſpiſe all the Charms and Flatteries of it; but what Vertue it is to renounce the poſſeſſion of any thing in this World, I cannot tell: It is in it ſelf no Vertue, that I know of, to be Poor, and therefore it can be no Vertue to chooſe Poverty. The World was made for the uſe of Man, and to uſe it well is an Argument of Vertue; but merely to have nothing in the World is none: To bear want with a patient mind, and a quiet ſubmiſſion to the Divine Providence, is a Vertue; but to chooſe want is none: Much leſs is it any vertue to renounce our private Poſſeſſions, to live plentifully upon a common Stock, and to be as intent in inriching a Monaſtery, as any Man can be to advance his private Fortunes; which is no great argument of a contempt of the World. And no more is it, to renounce all honeſt and induſtrious

ſtrious ways of living, as ſome do, and to turn imperious and godly Beggars, and live deliciouſly on the ſpoils and ſuperſtition of the people.

Cœlibacy it ſelf is no Vertue, for then Marriage, which is the Ordinance of God, and a Popiſh Sacrament, muſt be a Vice. For there is no Vertue, ſtrictly ſo called, but is oppoſed to ſome Vice; and Cœlibacy is oppoſed to nothing but Marriage: and therefore we muſt ſeek for the vertues of Cœlibacy, not merely in a vow againſt Marriage, which is no Vertue; but as it ſignifies a great mortification to all bodily Pleaſures, and is a means to advance us to a more Divine and heavenly ſtate of Mind: and every degree of Vertue we attain to, ſhall receive a proportionable reward: And thus Cœlibacy, though it be not a ſtate of Perfection it ſelf, yet may advance us to a more perfect State, and if we are the better Men for it, we ſhall have the greater reward. But to vow Cœlibacy, and to burn with Luſt, and to practiſe all the impurities of the Stews; to renounce Marriage, and to defile Wives and Virgins, and ſtill to call this a more perfect State than Marriage, is a work of *Supererogation* indeed, but whether it be ſupererogating Vertue or Vice, God will judge; who has forbid all uncleanneſs, and inſtituted Marriage, not only for the propagation of mankind, but as a remedy againſt Luſt.

To vow abſolute obedience to any Creature, without reſerving to our ſelves a judgment, whether what he commands be good or evil, is ſo far from being a State of Perfection, that it is

an encroachment upon the Divine Prerogative, and gives such obedience to Men, as is due only to God. This is expresly contrary to our Saviour's precept; *But call no Man Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are Brethren. And call no Man your Father upon earth; for one is your Father, which is in Heaven. Neither be ye called Masters; for one is your Master, even Christ*, Matthew 23. 8, 9, 10. which does not oppose the use of these names in common Speech; but forbids us to ascribe such an Authority to any Man on Earth, as is due only to God and Christ: And if a vow of blind obedience does not make Men our Masters in this forbidden sense, I think nothing can. Thus voluntary and unnecessary severities to the Body, which serve no ends of Mortification or Devotion; saying over a great number of *Ave Maries*, going in Pilgrimage to *Jerusalem*, or *Loretto*, or to the Shrine of any other powerful Saints; to give all our Estates for saying Masses for the Dead; to adore Reliques and Images, to kiss the Pavement of such a Church, or some Cross drawn on it; to say over some particular Prayers, so many times a day, or to pray before such a particular Altar; and such like things, as by the liberality of Popes, have so many thousand years Indulgence for a reward, are indeed works of *Supererogation*, because God has not commanded them, but I doubt are no Christian excellencies. Such things as these make Men Saints, and enrich the Church with Merits, and much good may do them with it.

X. *Every*

X. *Every Soul as ſoon as expired is conveyed to Heaven or Hell.*

In Anſwer to this, I told him, that *the Scripture gives us no account of any other places of rewards and puniſhments in the other World, but Heaven and Hell.* And that this propoſition, *that every Soul, as ſoon as expired, is conveyed to Heaven or Hell, is only an Inference from this Doctrine, that we know of no other place, they ſhould go to after death, the Scripture having not told us of any other.* That our Church, though She rejects Purgatory, yet has not determined againſt an intermediate State, between Death and Judgment. Though Chriſt's *Parable of* Dives *and* Lazarus, *and S.* Paul's *deſire to be diſſolved and to be with Chriſt, look fairly* towards proving that good Men go to Heaven, and bad Men directly to Hell, when they die.

He takes notice only of this laſt paſſage of *Dives* and *Lazarus* and S. *Paul*; and ſays, that this would prove ſomething, *if three Souls or All, or All Souls expire in either* Dives's *fitneſs for Hell, or* Lazarus's *and S.* Paul's *for Heaven.* But he ſhould have taken the whole proof together; that there is no mention made in Scripture of any other place of rewards or puniſhments in the next World, but Heaven and Hell; and that whereever we have any account of the ſtate of Men after Death, we either hear of them, in Heaven or Hell. As *Dives*, when he died,

was immediately tormented in Hell, and *Lazarus* was conveyed into *Abraham's* boſom, and S. *Paul* expected, when he died, to go immediately to Heaven, and to be with Chriſt: but we read of no Man, who went to Purgatory when he died: and what other proof can we have of this, but that Heaven is promiſed to good Men, and Hell threatned againſt bad Men; and we have ſome examples of both recorded in Scripture; unleſs we expect the Scripture ſhould give us a compleat Catalogue of all, who were ſaved or damned in thoſe days.

As for Mens *fitneſs* for Heaven or for Hell, when they die; I know not well, what he means by it. For Men may be *fit*, as he calls it, for Hell, who are not as wicked, as *Dives*, and we all have reaſon to hope, that thoſe may be fit for Heaven, who are not ſo holy as St. *Paul* was. Though there are different degrees of Vice and Vertue, which may qualifie Men for different degrees of rewards and puniſhments, yet as we read in Scripture, but of two ſtates in the other World, Heaven and Hell, ſo we read but of two diſtinctions of Men in this World, the good and the bad, to whom theſe promiſes or threatnings belong. Now every Man, when he dies, muſt be one of theſe, either a penitent or an impenitent ſinner; for the Scripture knows no *medium* between them. If he be a penitent ſinner, by the gracious terms of the Goſpel, he has a right to pardon of ſin, and eternal life; and why is not that Man fit for Heaven, who has

has a Covenant-right to it? and what ſhould detain him in Purgatory, who has an immediate right to Heaven? if he be an impenitent ſinner, Hell is his portion, and he muſt have it.

But after all, this is no controverſie between us, and the Church of *Rome*, whether *every Soul as ſoon as expired is conveyed to Heaven or Hell*; but whether thoſe, who ſhall finally be ſaved muſt ſuffer the pains of Purgatory in the other World, before they ſhall be received into Heaven. Our Author has a mind to confound theſe two, and ſeems to think it proof enough, that there is a Purgatory, if there be a middle ſtate between death and judgment, which is neither Heaven nor Hell; and poſſibly thoſe, who do not underſtand this Controverſie, may be deceived with ſuch pretences, and therefore it will be convenient briefly to ſtate this matter.

There have been, I confeſs, very different opinions among ſome of the Fathers, about the ſtate of Souls departed, both before and ſince the Reſurrection of Chriſt from the dead, as you ſhall hear more preſently; and there may be very different opinions about it ſtill, and I believe will be among thoughtful and inquiſitive Men, and no great hurt done neither, while they are not made Articles of Faith, nor the foundation of ſome new and unſcriptural worſhip.

But

But that our People may not be impoſed on with ſham-proofs, which are nothing to the purpoſe (as it is plain this Author intended to do in this Article) it will be neceſſary plainly to repreſent the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* concerning Purgatory, that they may know, what proofs to demand of it.

Now the Council of *Trent* determines no more, than that *there is a Purgatory, and that the Souls, which are detained there, are helpt by the Suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the moſt acceptable Sacrifice of the Altar:* and commands *the Biſhops diligently to take care, that the wholeſome Doctrine of Purgatory delivered by the holy Fathers and Councils, be believed, held, taught, and preached, to Chriſt's faithful People.*

Purgatorium eſſe, animaſq; ibi detentas, fidelium ſuffragiis, potiſſimum vero acceptabili altaris ſacrificio juvari præcipit Sancta Synodus Epiſcopis, ut ſanam de purgatorio Doctrinam, à ſanctis patribus & ſacris conciliis traditam, Chriſti fidelibus credi, teneri, doceri, & ubique prædicari diligenter ſtudeant. Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 25. decret. de purgat.

The Fathers of this Council were very careful, not to determine, what Purgatory is, what the puniſhments of it are, where the place of it is, but refer us to former Fathers and Councils for it: and therefore among the reſt, I ſuppoſe, they mean the Council of *Florence*; where this purgation is expreſly affirmed to be by fire, and to be a ſtate of puniſhment. Cardinal *Bellarmine*, who wrote ſince the Council of *Trent*, underſtood Fathers and Councils, and the ſenſe of the *Roman* Church, as well as

as any Man, and therefore I ſhall briefly ſhew, what he thought of this matter.

That *Bellarmine* did believe, that Souls departed were purged with fire, is abundantly evident from what he diſcourſes, on 1 *Cor.* 3. and from thoſe teſtimonies of the Fathers, which he abuſes to this purpoſe. *De purgat. l. 1. cap. 5. cap. 10. l. 2. cap. 10, 11, 12.*

But for what end theſe puniſhments ſerve, is as conſiderable as Purgatory fire it ſelf; and they, *Bellarmine* tells us, are to expiate venial ſins, or ſuch mortal ſins, whoſe guilt is pardoned, but not the temporal puniſhment due to them; For according to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, there are ſome venial ſins, which in their own nature do not deſerve eternal, but only temporal puniſhments: and as for mortal ſins, when the guilt of them is pardoned by the Sacrament of Penance, by Confeſſion, and the Abſolution of the Prieſt, yet there remains a temporal puniſhment to be undergone by the penitent, either in this World, or in Purgatory. So that if Men die under any venial ſins, or mortal ſins, whoſe guilt is remitted, which they have not made compleat ſatisfaction for in this World, they muſt bear the temporal puniſhments of theſe ſins in Purgatory: and therefore as very good Men, who have neither any venial, nor mortal ſins, to ſatisfie for, go directly to Heaven, when they die; and bad Men, who are under the guilt of mortal ſins, go directly to Hell: ſo thoſe, who are indifferently good, *i. e.* who have only venial ſins, or the temporal puniſhment of mortal *Cap.* 11.

mortal ſins to make ſatisfaction for; what is wanting of a compleat ſatisfaction for theſe ſins, while they lived, muſt be made up in Purgatory.

For we muſt not think, that this fire of Purgatory is for the purging or reforming ſinners, that they may aſcend more pure and refined into Heaven; but only and meerly to bear that Temporal puniſhment, which is due to ſin. For the Cardinal induſtriouſly proves, That the Souls in Purgatory can neither merit nor ſin; that they are perfect in Charity, and conſequently in all other Graces; and come no more perfect out of Purgatory, than they went in; but when they have paid the uttermoſt Farthing, have undergone all that Temporal puniſhment, which is due to their ſins, then they ſhall be releaſed, and received into Heaven.

Idem l. 2. cap. 3, 4.

But becauſe this is a very uncomfortable Doctrine, That Men muſt lie many Hundred or Thouſand Years in Purgatory, which differs from the torments of Hell only in the continuance of them, (for Purgatory is as hot as Hell, but one is Temporal, and the other Eternal) which is a very terrible conſideration, that we muſt be tormented for many Hundred Years, though not for ever; therefore they tell us, that the Souls in Purgatory may be relieved by the Prayers and Alms of the living, and by the Sacrifice of the Maſs; and principally by Indulgences, which the Pope diſpenſes and applies to particular Perſons, out of the Treaſury of the Church, which

Ibid. c. 14.

Cap. 16.

which conſiſts of the Merits of ſupererogating Saints.

This ſhort account I have given of the Doctrine of *Purgatory*; not that I intend to ſpend time to confute it now; to ſhow how groundleſs it is; how injurious to the Goodneſs of God, and to the Merits of Chriſt; how contrary to the Senſe of the Primitive Church, and of moſt, if not all, Chriſtian Churches at this day, excepting the Church of *Rome*; but to let our People ſee, what kind of proofs they muſt demand for Purgatory; which alone will be ſufficient to ſecure them from the attacques of their wittieſt Adverſaries. As to ſhow this particularly.

Firſt, to prove a middle ſtate between Death and Judgment, which is neither Heaven nor Hell, does not prove a Popiſh Purgatory. Who ever is acquainted with the Writings of the Fathers of the firſt four Ages, muſt confeſs, that this was a received Opinion among them; that no Man, excepting Chriſt himſelf, was received into Heaven till the day of Judgment. I ſhall not multiply Quotations to this purpoſe, which the Learned know where to find. *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* prove this from the example of Chriſt, to which we muſt be conformed. For Chriſt himſelf did not aſcend into Heaven till after his Reſurrection; but as his Body reſted in the Grave, ſo his Soul went into the place of Souls departed; and when he aroſe again, then he aſcended into Heaven. And thus we muſt do alſo.

Irenæus l. 5. contr. hæreſ. c. 31. Tert. de anima, cap. 55.

ſo. When we die, our Souls ſhall live in thoſe places, which God has prepared for ſeparate Souls, and there they muſt remain till the Reſurrection; and when we have re-aſſumed our Bodies, we ſhall be admitted into the higheſt Heavens, whither Chriſt is aſcended. This they affirm in oppoſition to thoſe *Gnoſtick* Hereticks, who taught, that as ſoon as they died, they ſhould aſcend above the Heavens to him whom they called the Father, which, * *Irenæus* ſays, is to exceed the order of promoting juſt Men, as being ignorant of the regular gradations and advances to Incorruption. And this he attributes to their denial of the Reſurrection of the Fleſh; for it is no wonder, that ſuch Men ſhould not know the order of the Reſurrection, who deny the Reſurrection. From whence it is plain, that in *Irenæus* his Opinion, no Man who believed the Reſurrection of the Fleſh, could reaſonably think, that the Souls of good Men did aſcend into Heaven till Soul and Body was united at the Reſurrection: ſince Chriſt himſelf did not aſcend into Heaven till after his Reſurrection: though he grants that ſome did believe ſo, who were Orthodox in the Article of the Reſurrection, though herein they agreed with Hereticks. That this was the Opinion of *Juſtin Martyr*, *Lactantius*, *Hilary*, S. *Ambroſe*, S. *Chryſoſtom*, and divers others, is at large proved by the learned Mr. *Daly*, and vindicated from the exceptions of Cardinal *Bellarmine*.

**Supergrediuntur ordinem promotionis juſtorum, & modos (al. motus) meditationis ad incorruptelam ignorant. Ir. ibid.*

Qui ergo univerſam reprobant reſurrectionem, & quantum in ipſis eſt, auferunt eam de medio, quid mirum eſt, ſi nec ordinem reſurrectionis ſciunt. —— Ibid.

Quidam ex his, qui putantur recte credidiſſe —— hereticos ſenſus inſe habentes. Ibid.

Dall. de pœnis & ſatisf. l. 5.

But

But how this differs from a Popiſh Purgatory will appear in theſe three particulars.

Firſt, That they affirmed this of all ſeparate Souls, That none were received into Heaven before the Reſurrection. Patriarchs, Prophets, Apoſtles, whatever they were; they continue in the ſtate of ſeparate Souls, and have not their full reward, and are not received into the higheſt Heavens, till the Reſurrection of their Bodies. This is the *Lex Mortuorum*, as *Irenæus* calls it, the Law of the Dead; the *ordo promotionis juſtorum*, the order in which juſt Men ſhall be advanced. For as S. *Chryſoſtom* affirms, If the Body do not riſe, the Soul remains uncrowned, out of that ſtate of bleſſedneſs, which is in Heaven. Whereas the *Popiſh* Purgatory is not for all Souls, but only for thoſe, who have not made a perfect ſatisfaction for their ſins in this life; and therefore muſt indure the temporal puniſhments due to them in Purgatory. Whereas the Souls of all Children, who die after Baptiſm, before the commiſſion of any actual ſin, and the Souls of good Men, who have completed their ſatisfaction in this life, according to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, aſcend directly into Heaven: which is expreſly denied by theſe Ancient Fathers; and was taught by few in thoſe days, but by ſuch Hereticks, as denied the Reſurrection of the Body.

Εἰ μὴ ἀνίσταται τὸ σῶμα, ἀστεφάνωτος ἡ ψυχὴ μένει ἔξω τῆς μακαριότητος τῆς ἐν οὐρανοῖς.

Secondly, According to theſe Ancient Fathers, this ſeparate ſtate, wherein the Souls of good Men continue till the Reſurrection, is not a ſtate of puniſhment, as the *Popiſh* Purgatory is, but of Joy and Felicity. They were divided indeed about the place, where the Souls of good Men lived till the Reſurrection; ſome placed it in ſecret receptacles within the Earth, and therefore called it the *Infernum*, as *Tertullian* did; others thought it was above the Earth in ſome Celeſtial Region, but below the higheſt Heavens; but they all agreed, that it was not Heaven, and that it was not a ſtate of puniſhment, but of reſt and happineſs: and therefore they called it *Abraham's Boſom*, *and Paradiſe*, which they diſtinguiſh from Heaven. *Tertullian* calls it a place of Divine pleaſantneſs, appointed for the Spirits of holy Men. The Author of the *Queſtions and Anſwers to the Orthodox*, in *Juſtin Martyr*, expreſly tells us, That when the Soul goes out of the Body, there is a great difference made between the Righteous and the Wicked. For they are carried by Angels to ſuch places, as are proper for them. The Souls of juſt Men into Paradiſe, where they have the converſation and ſight of Angels and Archangels, and the viſion (ὀπτασίαν) of our Saviour Chriſt; as it is written, *being abſent from the body, we are preſent with the Lord.* —— From hence *Bellarmine* concludes, That by *Paradiſe* this Author underſtands Heaven, becauſe there we ſhall have the Viſion of Chriſt,

Locum divinæ amœnitatis recipiendis ſanctorum ſpiritibus deſtinatum. Tert. Apol. cap. 47.

Juſtin Martyr l. reſp. ad Orth. quæſt. 75.

Chriſt, and therefore that Paradiſe muſt ſignifie that place, where Chriſt is preſent: Which is directly contrary to the Doctrine of this Author, who makes Paradiſe only a receptacle of ſeparate ſouls, till the Reſurrection. But though it be not Heaven, there is, he ſays, a great communication between Heaven and Paradiſe; for they have the frequent viſits and converſation of Angels and Archangels, whom they ſee and converſe with, as they do with one another; but when he ſpeaks of Chriſt, he expreſly makes a diſtinction between their ſight of, and converſation with Angels, and Chriſt; for this latter is only *ut invisa* by way of Viſion, as we ſee things, which are abſent and at a diſtance; but yet this does ſo ſtrongly affect them, that he thinks, that of S. *Paul* may be applied to it, *being abſent from the Body, we are preſent with the Lord.* And certainly this is no Popiſh Purgatory, but as they thought, the very next degree of happineſs to Heaven it ſelf.

Thus S. *Hilary* expreſly aſſerts, that the ſtate of Souls departed is a ſtate of happineſs; and S. *Ambroſe* tells us; that while the fulneſs of time comes, the Souls are in expectation of ſuch a Reſurrection as they deſerve: Puniſhment expects ſome, and Glory others; and yet neither bad Souls are in the mean time without puniſhment, nor the good without reaping ſome fruits of their

Hilar. in Pſal. 2. & in Pſal. 120.

Ergo dum expectatur plenitudo temporis, expectant animæ Reſurrectionem debitam. Alias manet pœna, alias gloria. Et tamen nec illæ interim ſine injuriâ, nec iſtæ ſine fructu. Ambr. de bono mortis cap. 10.

Vertue:

Verſe: But I need not multiply Quotations to prove that which no modeſt Man, who is acquainted with the Doctrine of the Fathers, can deny.

Thirdly, Another difference is, That this is an unalterable State till the day of Judgment, and therefore no Popiſh Purgatory, out of which, as the *Church of Rome* pretends, Souls may be redeemed by the Prayers and Alms and Maſſes of the Living, and aſcend immediately into Heaven. This is evident from what I have already ſaid, that this State is to laſt till the Reſurrection, according to the ſenſe of the ancient Fathers; as *Tertullian* expreſly affirms, that Heaven is open to none, while this Earth laſts; but the Kingdom of Heaven ſhall be opened with the end of the World: And S. *Chryſoſtom* obſerves from the Parable of *Dives* and *Lazarus*; that the Souls of Men after their depature out of theſe Bodies, are carried to a certain place, from whence they cannot go out, when they will, but there expect the terrible day of Judgment: Which plainly ſhows, what his belief was, that they muſt continue in that State, which they enter upon at Death, till the Reſurrection: And this I think is ſufficient to ſhow the difference between a Popiſh Purgatory, and that middle ſtate between Death and Judgment, which the ancient Fathers taught.

Nulli patet cœlum terra adhuc ſalva, ne dixerim clauſa, cum tranſactione enim mundi reſerabuntur regna cœlorum. Tert. Apol. cap. 47.

Chryſ. Hom. 29. in Matth.

Secondly,

Secondly, Nor is it ſufficient to prove a Popiſh Purgatory, that the Ancient Fathers did believe, that all Men muſt paſs through the Fire at the day of Judgment. That thoſe, who were perfectly good, ſhould receive no hurt nor damage by it; that thoſe who had any remains of corruption about them, ſhould be detained a longer or ſhorter time in that laſt Fire, till they were purged from their ſins; and that bad Men ſhould irrecoverably ſink down into endleſs burnings. This was a received opinion among the Ancient Fathers, that at the day of Judgment all Men ſhould be tried by Fire, which is ſo univerſally acknowledged, that I need not prove it by particular Quotations. But yet there is an irreconcileable difference between this opinion, and the Popiſh Doctrine of Purgatory; as will appear in theſe particulars.

1. That the Popiſh Purgatory is now, and has been in being at leaſt ſince the time of our Saviour; and that thoſe, who deſerve the fire of Purgatory, fall into it, when they go out of theſe Bodies; whereas the Fire, which the Fathers ſpeak of, is not till the day of Judgment. This was the opinion of *Lactantius*, *Hilary*, *Ambroſe*, and S. *Auguſtin* himſelf: who expreſly tells us, that this Fire is at the end of the World, *in fine ſeculi*; and therefore not the Popiſh Purgatory, which, as they would perſwade us, is already kindled, and has been for many hundred Years. *Aug. l. 16. de C. D. c. 24.*

Indeed

Indeed S. *Auguſtin*, though he owns that fiery trial at the laſt Judgment, as the Fathers before him did; yet he has ſomething peculiar in this matter, which none of the Fathers before him ever taught; and therefore having no Authority of Tradition, it muſt reſt wholly upon his own Authority, who had no more Authority to invent any new Doctrine in his Age, than we have in ours: There are three or four places in S. *Auguſtin*, which do ſpeak of ſome Purgatory fires, which ſome Men muſt undergo between Death and Judgment, which looks moſt like the Popiſh Purgatory of any thing in the Ancient Fathers; and I believe was the firſt occaſion of it; which may be the reaſon, why this Doctrine has ſo much prevailed in the *Latin* Church, which was acquainted with S. *Auſtin*'s Writings; when it has been always rejected by the *Greeks*, as is evident from the Council of *Florence*. But there are two things to be ſaid to this:

Firſt, That St. *Auſtin* ſpeaks very doubtfully about it. That there may be ſuch puniſhments after this life (he ſays) is not incredible, and we may examine, whether there be any ſuch thing or not; and it may either be found, or may ſtill continue a ſecret, whether ſome Chriſtians, according to the degree of their love and

Tale aliquid etiam poſt hanc vitam fieri incredibile non eſt, & utrum ita ſit, quæri poteſt; & aut inveniri, aut latere, nonnullos fideles per ignem quendam Purgatorium, quanto magis minuſve bona pretantia diléxerunt, tanto tardius, citiúſve, ſalvari. Aug. Enchirid. c. 69.

affection

affection for these perishing enjoyments, be not sooner or later saved by a certain Purgatory fire; and in another place he says, he does not reprove this opinion, for it may be, it is true: now *non arguo, quia forsitan verum est. De C. D. l.* 21. *c.* 25. And elsewhere he says, That though such speculations may serve for his own, or other Mens, instruction, yet he does not attribute any Canonical authority to them, and therefore he was very far from making it an Article of Faith, as the Church of *Rome* has done.

Cum iis quæ descripsimus, ita nostra vel aliorum exerceatur, vel erudiatur, infirmitas, ut tamen in eis nulla velut canonica constituatur authoritas. Aug. de octo Quæst. Dulcitii Quæst. 3.

Secondly, And yet, though St. *Austin* speaks of a Purgatory fire after death, and before the day of judgment, he seems by his whole discourse never to have thought of such a Purgatory, as the Church of *Rome* has invented. The occasion of what he says to this purpose, is that noted place, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. *For other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; Every Mans works shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every Mans work of what sort it is: if any Mans work abide, which he built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any Mans work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, but so as by fire.* Some

there were, who from this place concluded; that thoſe who held the foundation, who believed in Chriſt, and continued in the unity of the Church, how wicked ſoever their lives were, ſhould at laſt be ſaved by fire: This St. *Auſtin* vehemently oppoſed, though it is very like the Doctrine or Practice of the Church of *Rome*, which ſends all good Catholick ſinners, how wicked ſoever their lives have been, to Purgatory; eſpecially if they have had time to confeſs, and receive Abſolution. They abſolve all that confeſs, and no Man, who is abſolved at the hour of death can go to Hell; but how wicked ſoever he is, he ſhall at laſt be ſaved by the fire of Purgatory. In oppoſition to this, St. *Auſtin* expounds *wood and hay, and ſtubble*, which ſome build upon the foundation, not of ſuch ſins as the Scripture tells us, will ſhut us out of the Kingdom of Heaven, ſuch as St. *Paul* mentions, 1 *Cor.* 6. 9, 10. *Neither Fornicators, nor Idolaters, nor Adulterers,* &c. *ſhall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*, but of ſuch a great paſſion for the preſent enjoyments of this World, though lawful and innocent in themſelves, that we cannot loſe them without great trouble and anxiety of mind: for when ſuch Men muſt ſuffer the loſs of all theſe things for Chriſt; if they hold the foundation, if they prefer Chriſt before all other things, they will ſuffer the loſs of all things for him; but then that fondneſs they have for this World, will make the loſs of theſe things very afflicting; *dolor urit*, ſuch ſorrow burns their Souls,

Aug. Enchiridion ad Laurent. cap. 67, 68, 69.

Souls, and is a kind of Purgatory fire to them in this World, which thoſe good Men eſcape, who ſit looſe from all preſent things, and therefore are not ſo much affected with the loſs of them; but thoſe who love this World too paſſionately, if notwithſtanding they can bear the loſs of all for Chriſt, ſhall be ſaved, but ſo as by fire; ſhall ſmart for their loving this World too well in thoſe burning and Purgatory flames, which an inordinate love and grief will kindle in their Souls.

This is what St. *Auſtin* underſtands by being ſaved by fire in this World, that ſorrow with which thoſe are burnt, when they loſe theſe things, who loved them too much, while they had them; but this Purgatory is in this life, and St. *Auſtin* queſtions, whether there may not be ſomething like this, *aliquid tale*, in the next World: that is, that after death Men who loved this World too well, may be greatly afflicted for the loſs of it; which is all the Purgatory fire before the day of judgment, that St. *Auſtin* ever thought of; and he was the firſt, that ever thought of this; and yet this is nothing at all to a Popiſh Purgatory, as every body will grant. So that though St. *Auſtin* was doubtful, whether there may not be ſome Purgatory puniſhments after death, for thoſe who were too fond of this life; that is, whether their leaving this World, and going into ſuch a different ſtate, where they can enjoy nothing, they were fond on here, will not greatly afflict and burn and torment their minds, either a longer or ſhorter

time according to the degree of their love to this World: yet neither St. *Auſtin*, nor any of the Fathers thought, that there was any material Purgatory fire (ſuch as the Popiſh Purgatory is) till the end of the World.

Secondly, Another difference between that fire which the Fathers mention, and the Popiſh Purgatory fire, reſpects the perſons, who are to be tried in it. For the Fathers taught, that at the day of judgment all Men, excepting Chriſt himſelf, muſt paſs through the fire: not St. *Peter*, nor St. *Paul*, nay not the bleſſed Virgin herſelf excepted. This is expreſly aſſerted by *Lactantius*, *Hilary*, *Ambroſe*, and many others. *We muſt all be tried by Fire, whoever deſires to return into Paradiſe*, ideo unus ignem illum ſentire non potuit, qui eſt juſtitia Dei, Chriſtus, quia peccatum non fecit. *Chriſt only, who is the righteouſneſs of God, and never committed any ſin, eſcapes that fire:* but they believed, that all Mankind beſides muſt paſs through it, that perfect good Men ſhall paſs, unhurt and untouched; that thoſe who are imperfectly good muſt be purged by fire, and ſhall ſuffer by the flames of it a longer or ſhorter time, as their purgation requires; and that bad Men ſhall ſink for ever into thoſe bottomleſs Lakes of Fire and Brimſtone.

Ambroſ. Serm. 20. in Pſal. 118.

But the Popiſh Purgatory is neither for very good, nor very bad Men. Bad Men immediately go to Hell, and perfect Saints aſcend directly into Heaven without paſſing the fire of Purgatory;

tory; which therefore cannot be that fire, the Fathers ſpeak of, which the moſt perfect Saints muſt paſs thorough into Heaven.

Thirdly, Another difference is, That the *Popiſh* Purgatory Fire is not for purgation; but the Fire at the Day of Judgment, according to the ancient Fathers, is. I obſerved before, that the *Popiſh* Purgatory is not to make Men better, for the Souls in Purgatory are perfect in all Graces, and can neither merit nor ſin; All that they have to do in Purgatory is to make ſatisfaction for that temporal puniſhment, which is due to their ſins: their ſins are already pardoned, and their Souls are purged; they perfectly love God, and are beloved by him; and yet unleſs they be relieved by the Prayers, and Alms, and Maſſes of the living, they may lie ſeveral Ages, in Purgatory, bearing the puniſhment of their ſins, when they are both pardoned and cleanſed from ſin; which may ſeem a little odd to thoſe Men, who remember, that Chriſt has born the puniſhment of our ſins; and who know no other end of puniſhments, but either to reform the ſinner, or to take vengeance on their ſins, which there is no room for, when the ſin is pardoned.

But now, though the ancient Fathers do deny, that there is any purgation of ſin between Death and Judgment; but that every Soul continues in the ſame ſtate, wherein Death found it, till the Day of Judgment; yet they make the Fire at the Day of Judgment to be truly Purgatory; to purge

us

us from all the remains of Corruption, juſt as Gold is purged and refined in the Fire: and therefore they tell us, that perfect Souls ſhall paſs through the Fire unhurt; but if there be any Lead mingled with our Gold, that muſt be burnt and diſſolved before we can paſs through this Fire into Heaven: now though this be very unintelligible alſo, how a material Fire can purge and refine a Soul, yet it ſhows, how much this differs from the *Popiſh* Purgatory, which burns and torments indeed, but does not purge and refine, and therefore is very improperly called a Purgatory Fire.

Origen indeed, whom Cardinal *Bellarmine*, and others quote for this Purgatory Fire, as they do alſo *Plato* and *Virgil*, did believe a Purgatory Fire in a true and proper ſenſe; for he believed all puniſhments, whether in this World, or in the next, were only Purgatory; that is not meerly for puniſhment, but for the correction and amendment of thoſe, who ſuffered. And therefore he did alſo believe, that the very worſt of Men, nay the Devils themſelves, ſhould at laſt be purged and cleanſed by Fire, and reſtored to a ſtate of happineſs. The ſumm of his Opinion in ſhort was this, That at the Day of Judgment, Chriſt will deſtroy this World with Fire, as he is ſaid, *to come in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them, that know not God.* And this Fire, which ſhall burn the World at the laſt Day, ſeems to be that Purgatory Fire, of which *Origen*, and ſome other Fathers ſpeak. Though I know ſome thought this

this Fire to be in the upper Regions, ſo as to intercept our aſcent into Heaven without paſſing through it. This will try all Men; for all muſt paſs through this Fire, as the Ancients believed; and thoſe, who had Hay or Stubble, or any combuſtible matter about them, who had any remains of corruption to be purged away, muſt ſtay in it a longer or ſhorter time, till they were thoroughly purged from their ſins; this as you have heard, was the general opinion of the Fathers, as well as of *Origen*, and therefore *Origen*'s Purgatory Fire is not the *Popiſh* Purgatory, becauſe that is not kindled till the Day of Judgment. But then *Origen* thought, that this purgation extended to the worſt of Men, and to Devils themſelves; that though they might lie many Ages in this Fire, before they are perfectly purged, yet they ſhould be purged at laſt, and reſtored to the favour and enjoyment of God. For which he was generally condemned by the Ancient Chriſtians, and principally by the Fifth general Council. And yet there were other Fathers, who were in ſome degree tainted with this opinion. For there are plain marks of it in *Gregory Nyſſen*, if his works were not corrupted by the *Origeniſts*, as ſome ſuſpect; and in S. *Hierome* himſelf. For though ſome would not allow of the final Salvation of Devils, yet they believed this of all Mankind, though never ſo wicked; others thought this muſt be confined to all Chriſtians; others to all thoſe Chriſtians, who were not guilty of Hereſie or Schiſm, how wicked

wicked ſoever they were otherwiſe. Theſe opinions are rejected and condemned by the *Romaniſts*, as well as by us, and therefore they ought not to alledge ſuch Authorities as theſe, which are nothing to their purpoſe. For that there will be ſuch a fire at the day of Judgment, does not prove, that there is one already kindled; and a Purgatory fire, which cleanſes and purges our ſins, does not prove, that there is ſuch a Purgatory Fire, as is only to puniſh thoſe, whoſe ſins are already pardoned and cleanſed.

Fourthly, There is another conſiderable difference between this *Popiſh* Purgatory, and the fire at the day of Judgment; that there is no redemption out of this by the Prayers, and Alms, and Maſſes of the living; which is the moſt conſiderable thing in the *Popiſh* Purgatory; and that for which I fear the Church of *Rome* does principally value it. For this ſets a good price upon Indulgences, gives great Authority to their Prieſts, inriches their Monaſteries, and is the great ſupport of the *Roman* Hierarchy. But as the Fathers ſay not one word about this, ſo the account I have already given of their opinions, is a demonſtration, that they could not think of any ſuch thing; becauſe this fire is not till the day of Judgment, and then I ſuppoſe, when we all come to be judged, you will grant it is too late to offer Prayers, and Alms, and Maſſes, for the Redemption of our ſelves or others from theſe Purgatory flames. The Fathers thought, that

that we must all undergo this purgation by fire, which would be longer or shorter, as we had more or fewer sins to be purged away, and therefore here can be no place, for the suffrages and intercessions of the living. According to the *Popish* Doctrine, those Souls, who are redeemed out of Purgatory, must be redeemed before the day of Judgment, and those who are not redeemed before, are on course redeemed then, for the *Roman* Purgatory must end at the day of Judgment; though the Purgatory fire the Fathers speak of, does but begin then.

Thirdly, This gives occasion to another observation: That the ancient practice of Praying for Souls departed, does not prove that there is a *Popish* Purgatory, or that those ancient Christians did believe that there was. That this was a very ancient practice I readily grant, as all Men must do, who know any thing of these matters, and yet from what I have discoursed it is evident, that they never dreamt of such a Purgatory, as the Church of *Rome* has now made an Article of Faith of, and therefore they could have no regard to the Redemption of Souls out of Purgatory in their Prayers for the dead, because they did not know of any such place.

But to what original then shall we attribute this custom of praying for the Dead? Truly, that is hard to say; there is not the least footsteps of it in the Canonical Scripture, neither of the Old nor New Testament, as *Tertullian* and

others acknowledge; and when it firſt came into the Church we cannot tell: that tender concern Men have for the memory of their dead Friends, which the Heathens themſelves ſhowed in their Oblations and Sacrifices, and funeral Rites for the Dead, ſeem to have given occaſion to it; and thoſe who were converted from Paganiſm to Chriſtianity, might ſtill believe, that the Dead challenged ſome part of our care and regard, which at firſt was tempered with a due reſpect to the Laws of Chriſtianity, but ſoon encreaſed into greater exceſſes, as it is the Nature of all Superſtitions to do. Prayers for the Dead ſeem at firſt to be uſed only at their Funerals, in time grew Anniverſary, and were celebrated by their own Friends and Relations, not with Propitiatory Sacrifices, but with ſome offerings for the relief of the Poor; and thus by degrees it crept into the ſervice of the Church; and at the Celebration of the Euchariſt, the Biſhop or Prieſt made mention of the names of Martyrs and Confeſſors, and Biſhops, and thoſe who had deſerved well of the Church, and particular Chriſtians in their private Devotions, remembred their own Relations and Friends; and thus it became a Cuſtom, without inquiring into the reaſons of it; till from this very cuſtom, people began to conclude, that ſuch Prayers, and Commemorations were very profitable to the Dead; and that thoſe, who had not lived ſo well as they ſhould do, might obtain the pardon of their ſins by the Prayers, and Interceſſions of the living: Which

I confeſs was a very natural thought, and ſhows us the eaſie progreſs of Superſtition; that cuſtoms taken up without any good reaſon, will find ſome reaſon, though a very bad one, when they grow popular. Upon this *Aërius* condemns the practice, and is reckoned among Heretieks for it: Though he only deſired to know, for what reaſon the names of dead Men are recited in the Celebration of the Euchariſt, and prayers made for them; whether by this means, thoſe, who died in ſin might obtain the pardon of their ſins; which he thought, if it were true, would make it unneceſſary for Men to live vertuouſly, if they had good pious Friends, who would pray for them, when they are dead: *Epiphanius* undertakes to confute *Aërius*, and we may eaſily perceive by him, that they were not ſo well agreed about the reaſon of it, as they were in the practice: Had he underſtood the Popiſh Doctrine of Purgatory, how eaſie had it been to anſwer it; that the reaſon of it was, that thoſe, who had died in a ſtate of Pardon, but had not made compleat ſatisfaction for the Temporal puniſhment due to their ſins, were to undergo this puniſhment in Purgatory; and that they might be relieved and delivered from Purgatory by the Prayers and Alms of their living Friends. This anſwer no doubt *Epiphanius* would have given had he known it, but he ſays not one word of this matter, which is a ſtrong preſumption, that he knew nothing of it; and gives ſuch other anſwers, as are no anſwer to *Aërius*.

Aërius demanded, what benefit the dead received by the prayers of the living, whether they would obtain for them the pardon of their ſins or not; to this *Epiphanius* ſays not one word, but gives ſuch reaſons for it, as reſpect the living not the dead. As that it ſignifies our belief, that thoſe who are dead to this World, do ſtill live in another State, are alive to God: That it ſignifies our good hopes of the happy ſtate of thoſe, who are gone hence, and to make a diſtinction between Chriſt, and all other good Men: For we pray for all but him, who interceeds for us all. Very worthy reaſons of praying for the dead! but however, what is all this to a Popiſh Purgatory? The two firſt reaſons do utterly overthrow it, which ſignifie, what good hopes we have of the happy and bleſſed ſtate of our deceaſed Friends, not that they are tormented in Purgatory, but that they reſt in the Lord: And ſo does the third, which declares, that they prayed for all but Chriſt himſelf. For Patriarchs, Prophets, Apoſtles, Martyrs, and the bleſſed Virgin her ſelf; for ſo the Church did, till praying for theſe Saints and Martyrs, was turned into Prayers and Supplications to them; and yet I ſuppoſe, no Man will ſay, that they prayed for theſe Glorious Saints, to pray them out of Purgatory; when the Church of *Rome* her ſelf will grant, that they were never in it.

There were ſome opinions in the ancient Church, which if they were not the firſt original of this cuſtom of praying for the Dead, yet were made

made uſe of by the Fathers to explain the meaning and uſe of it. Thus as I have ſhowed you, the Fathers believed, that the ſouls of good Men after Death did not immediately aſcend into Heaven, but were detained till the Reſurection of their Bodies, in a place of Reſt and Happineſs, which they called *Abrahams Boſom*, or *Paradiſe*: Now their Happineſs not being complete, they thought it very fit to recommend them unto God in their Prayers, and beg God to remember them, which ſuppoſes, that they were not in the immediate preſence of God; for it would be abſurd to beg God to remember them, who conſtantly attend his Throne and Preſence: And therefore they pray not for ſouls, who are tormented in Purgatory, but *qui dormiunt in ſomno pacis*, who ſleep in peace, *qui requieverunt in fide*, who dying in the true Faith, are gone to Reſt; *qui dormierunt & quieverunt in fide*, who ſleep and reſt in the Faith, as we find in the ancient Liturgies: And yet they pray, that *God would give them reſt, by the water of reſt in the boſom of Abraham with Iſaac and Jacob, that he would nouriſh them in a pleaſant place by the waters of reſt*: that is, That he would continue and increaſe this intermediate ſtate of Reſt and Happineſs to them. For they did not think it improper to pray for what they knew, the ſouls departed already enjoyed; no more than we do in this State, to pray for ſuch bleſſings, as we already have.

Cyrilli Hieroſol. liturgia.

Syr. orationes. Bibl. patrum. T. 6.

Another

Another opinion among them, was concerning the *Millennium* or thouſand Years Reign with Chriſt on Earth, which was to be before their admiſſion into Heaven, in the new *Jeruſalem*, which comes down from Heaven. Now during theſe thouſand Years they thought, that all juſt Men ſhould riſe again, but ſome ſooner, and others later according to their different merits. Some at the beginning of the thouſand Years, others two or three hundred Years after, others nearer the concluſion of them, according to their different merits and deſerts; as *Tertullian* particularly explains it. And as the Learned Mr. *Dally* obſerves, ſeveral paſſages in their Prayers do plainly refer to this: As when *Tertullian* directs a Widow to pray for her Husband, *prima Reſurrectionis conſortium*, a part in the firſt Reſurrection. And S. *Ambroſe* prays for *Gratian* and *Valentinian*, *Te quæſo, ſumme Deus, ut cariſſimos juvenes matura Reſurrectione ſuſcites, & reſuſcites*: That God would raiſe thoſe beloved young Men with an early Reſurrection. The like may be ſeen in the *Gothick Miſſal*, and elſewhere; and this I think has nothing to do with the Popiſh Purgatory.

Tertull. contra Marcion. c. 24. Dall. de pœnis & ſatisf. l. 5. c. 9. Tert. de monog. c. 10.

Ambr. de obitu Val.

Bibl. Patr. T. 6.

Another opinion they had regard to in their prayers for the dead was the fire of the day of Judgment, which they believed all Men muſt paſs thorough, before they could enter into Heaven, and continue a longer or ſhorter time in it, as they had more or fewer ſins to purge away: And therefore this laſt and terrible Judgment

ment being yet to come, they prayed, that God would forgive their ſins; and be merciful to them, and deliver them in the day of Judgment, of which there are ſome remains ſtill in the Roman Offices for the Dead.

Thus according to Mens different opinions, they had different intentions in their prayers for the dead, which is a ſign, as I obſerved before, that though they were agreed in the practice, the original reaſons of this practice were not known, but Men gueſſed at them, as they could, and altered their reaſons, as they changed their opinions.

Hence it is, that S. *Auſtin* and S. *Chryſoſtom*, though they never dreamt of a Popiſh Purgatory, yet ſpeak very differently of theſe matters from thoſe, who went before them. For in their days they began to call upon the Saints, and to beg their help, and then S. *Auſtin* thought it very improper to pray for thoſe, whoſe help they themſelves expected: According to that known ſaying of his, That he is injurious to a Martyr, who prays for him. Hence he makes three diſtinctions of ſouls departed, which the Church never heard of before. From whence I doubt not, but the Church of *Rome* learnt their diſtinctions, and accordingly allotted three different States for theſe three ſorts of Men, Heaven, Purgatory, and Hell. For S. *Auſtin* taught, that ſome were ſo perfectly good, that there was no need of Prayers or Oblations for them; others imperfectly good; and for theſe,

prayers,

prayers were profitable; others very bad, who cannot be redeemed by the ſuffrages of the living. The firſt of theſe the Church of *Rome* place in Heaven, the ſecond in Purgatory, the third in Hell; and let us firſt ſee, whether S. *Auſtin* were of that mind; for if he were not, they cannot prove a Purgatory from him, whatever becomes of his prayers for the dead.

Now it is evident, that Saint *Auſtin* was of the ſame mind with thoſe Fathers, who went before him, concerning the ſtate of ſouls departed; *viz.* that none were received into Heaven till the Reſurrection; as he expreſly affirms of all ſouls, that *during the time between death, and the laſt Reſurrection, they are kept in hidden receptacles.* He divides the Church into two parts, that which is ſtill on Earth, or that which after death reſts in the ſecret receptacles and ſeats of ſouls. Which he calls *Abraham*'s Boſom, and teaches, that all departed ſouls, either rejoyce in *Abraham*'s Boſom, or are tormented in eternal Fire: And that by *Abraham*'s Boſom he does not mean Heaven, is evident from what he elſewhere ſays; that though after this life we ſhall not go to that place, where the Saints ſhall be, when it ſhall be ſaid to them, *Come ye bleſſed of my Father, receive the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundations of the world,* (which he repreſents as the common belief of all Chriſtians, for he ſays, *quis neſcit?* Who knows not this?) yet we may be there, where *Dives* ſaw *Lazarus* at reſt, *viz.* in *Abraham*'s Boſom;

Enchirid. ad Laurent.

De civit. Dei l. 12. c. 9.

in

in illâ requie certè ſecurus, expectabis judicii diem, in that reſt you will ſecurely expect the day of Judgment. *Idem, Tract. 10. in Ep. Joan.*

So that though S. *Auſtin* thought, that ſome ſouls were ſo good and perfect, that there was no need to pray for them, yet he did not think, that the moſt perfect ſouls aſcended immediately into Heaven, as the Church of *Rome* now teaches; but were happy and at reſt in Paradiſe or *Abraham*'s Boſom till the Reſurrection.

Nor did he think, that thoſe for whom he ſays our prayers are available, thoſe who are imperfectly good, did after this life go into Purgatory, there to bear the puniſhment of their ſins. For what S. *Auſtin* thought of Purgatory, you have already heard, which has nothing like a Popiſh Purgatory in it. He prayed for his Mother *Monica*, that God would forgive her all her ſins, and ſhow mercy to her; did he believe then, that his Mother was in Purgatory? by no means; for he expreſly ſays, *& credo, jam feceris quod te rogo, ſed voluntaria oris mei approba domine. I believe, thou haſt already done, what I now pray for, but accept O Lord the free-will offerings of my mouth.* He believed his Mother was in a ſtate of reſt; but hoped, that God would accept his pious affection for his Mother, and that ſhe was not yet ſo perfect, but ſhe might receive ſome benefit by it. To be ſure the Church of *Rome* can never re-

concile this prayer with their Doctrine; for they teach, that ſins are not pardoned in Purgatory, but thoſe, who are pardoned before they die, ſuffer the temporal puniſhment of their ſins in Purgatory; whereas S. *Auſtin* does not Pray, that his Mother may be delivered from the pains of Purgatory, but that God would forgive her ſins.

The truth is, S. *Auſtin* was at a great loſs between vindicating the ancient practice of the Church in Praying for Souls departed, and giving a reaſonable and juſtifiable account of it: the Church did pray for Souls departed, and therefore there muſt be ſome reaſon given of it; or elſe theſe Prayers are vain and hypocritical, if they ſerve no good end. And yet in his days they began to think, and he himſelf was of that mind, that there were a great many Saints and Martyrs, who did not want their Prayers; who were fitter to be Intercеſſors themſelves for thoſe on Earth, than to receive any benefit from their Intercеſſions: and yet the Church prayed for all; for the moſt perfect Saints, for the Apoſtles and Martyrs, and the bleſſed Virgin her ſelf. This he knew not how to reconcile, but by ſaying, That when the Church prayed for Saints and Martyrs, Prophets and Apoſtles, the meaning of her Prayers was not to intercede with God for them, but to praiſe God for their Graces and Vertues; but when ſhe prayed for meaner Chriſtians, her Prayers were Interceſſions for Pardon and Reſt

to

to their Souls; and yet they were all prayed for in the ſame form of words, and the ancient Church made no ſuch diſtinction between them: and thus he reconciles the matter by expounding the ſame words to two different and contrary ſenſes, as they are applied to different ſubjects, which has taught the Church of *Rome*, when occaſion ſerves, to ſoften her Prayers, by expounding them contrary to the plain and natural ſignification of the words: that the moſt direct and formal Prayers to Saints and the Virgin for all Temporal and Spiritual Bleſſings, when they pleaſe, ſhall ſignifie no more than a bare *Ora pro nobis, Pray for us.*

About this time S. *Chryſoſtom* alſo, in the *Greek* Church, defended this practice of Praying for the Dead; and yet the Doctrine of *Purgatory* never was received in the *Greek* Church, as appears from the Council of *Florence*; which is a plain ſign, That though the *Roman* Doctors think they have proved Purgatory, if they can but prove, that the ancient Church uſed to Pray for the Dead, (which no Body denies) yet the *Greek* Church did not, and does not to this day, think this a good conſequence; for they Pray for the Dead, but deny a *Popiſh* Purgatory. Which ſhows, that though they prayed for the Dead, they did it for other reaſons, than the Church of *Rome* now does.

And yet S. *Chryſoſtom* does not agree with S. *Auſtin* in that diſtinction he makes of Souls departed, which ſhows that there was no certain tradition about this matter, but Men of Wit and Learning framed different Hypotheſes and Schemes of things to themſelves, as they thought, they could beſt give an account of this practice: For this was the thing both S. *Auſtin* and S. *Chryſoſtom* were intent on, to juſtifie the practice of the Church, ſo that their Prayers for the Dead might not be thought vain and hypocritical.

But whereas S. *Auſtin* diſtinguiſhes Souls departed into three orders; thoſe, who are ſo perfectly good, that they need not our Prayers; others, leſs perfect, to whom our Prayers are beneficial; and a third ſort ſo wicked that their eſtate is irrecoverable, and ſo paſt the relief of our Prayers; S. *Chryſoſtom* mentions but two ſorts, ſincere good Chriſtians; and Infidels, and ſuch as die without Baptiſm, and bad Chriſtians, whom he places in the ſame rank. As for the firſt, he expreſly tells us, that after Death they are in a ſtate of Reſt and Happineſs, and upon this very account condemns thoſe extravagant expreſſions of ſorrow at their Funerals; and therefore he never thought of a *Popiſh* Purgatory; for I think we have great reaſon to lament thoſe, who are in Purgatory, a place of torment, though not Hell. As for others, he thinks, they deſerve our Sorrow and Compaſſion, and Prayers and Alms, not that this can deliver them out

Chryſ. Serm. 3. in Philip. ed. Savil. Tom 4. p. 20. & in Hebr. Ser. 4. p. 453.

Chryſ. Homil. 21 in Act. T. 4. p. 734.

out of the ſtate of the damned, but that he thought it gave ſome little eaſe and relief to their torments. And this was not only the ſenſe of S. *Chryſoſtom*, that the damned themſelves were eaſed by the Prayers of the living, but S. *Auſtin* ſeems to be of the ſame mind, when he ſays, that the ſuffrages of the living are profitable, either *ut plena fiat remiſſio, aut tolerabilior ſit ipſa damnatio*; to obtain perfect forgiveneſs, or to make damnation it ſelf more tolerable. And I think what *Baſil* of *Seleucia* relates concerning *Thecla*, That by her Prayers ſhe obtained the Soul of *Falconilla*, who died a *Pagan*, ſignifies, that he believed ſomething more than this; that the Prayers of the living may not only eaſe the torments of the damned, but deliver them out of Hell it ſelf.

Aug. Enchirid. ad Laurent.

Now this the Church of *Rome* believes no more than we do. They reject all the reaſons for which the Ancients prayed for the Dead, and have invented ſome new reaſons, which the ancient Fathers never thought of, *viz.* to Pray Men out of Purgatory: and therefore though they ſtill Pray for the Dead, and we do not; yet they no more Pray for the Dead, in the ſenſe of the ancient Church, than we do: however, I think, from hence it appears, that they cannot prove a *Popiſh Purgatory* from the practice of the ancient Church in Praying for the Dead; which is all I intended to prove at this time.

XI. *Deſiring*

XI. *Deſiring the Interceſſions of the bleſſed, is more ſuperſtitious, and derogatory to our Lord's Mediatorſhip, than intreating the Prayers of holy Men Militant.*

This I anſwered, *Was as plain in Scripture, as that Chriſt is our only Mediator in Heaven, who alone (like the high Prieſt under the Law, who was his Type) is admitted into the Holy of Holies, to make expiation, and to interceed for us.* ——— *The ſumm of what we teach about this matter is this: That we muſt worſhip none but God, and therefore muſt not Pray to Saints and Angels, as our Saviour teaches*; Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve. *That* there is but one Mediator between God and man, the man Chriſt Jeſus; *and therefore we muſt not make more Mediators to our ſelves, nor put our truſt in the Interceſſion of Saints and Angels. Thus far we have plain Scripture proof; and then we think common ſenſe teaches us the reſt: That it is an injury to an Only Mediator to ſet up other Mediators with him. That good Men on Earth are not Mediators, but Supplicants, which is no encroachment on Chriſt's Mediatorſhip; and that Saints in Heaven according to the Church of* Rome, *Pray as Mediators and Interceſſors, who appear in the preſence of God for us; and this is not reconcilable with Chriſt's Onely Mediatorſhip in Heaven.*

Anſwer to Requeſt, *p.* 10, 11.

To

To this our Author anſwers, *Page* 7. *It is not at all in Scripture, that our Saviour is our only Mediator of Interceſſion; therefore this propoſition is not plain there. If ſuch an only Mediatorſhip of Interceſſion be plain in Scripture, it had been eaſie and kind to have named ſuch a plain Scripture. Yet none is brought, unleſs the Anſwerer meant*, Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, *&c. for ſuch a one. Truly I ſee not how he can deduce from it any thing to his purpoſe, till it appear, that all Prayer is Divine Worſhip, or that we Pray to Saints juſt as we do to God.* This is all his anſwer, and I think, I might truſt every ordinary Reader with it without any reply; but I muſt be civil to our Author; and therefore will try, if I can make him underſtand this matter.

The Reader will eaſily ſee, That that Text, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God*, and what he has concealed in an, *&c.* as if he were afraid to let his own People, who poſſibly may read his Book, know what follows, *and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*, was never intended to prove, that Chriſt is our *only Mediator of Interceſſion*. The proof I inſiſt on, is in 1 *Timothy*, 2. 5. *There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the Man Chriſt Jeſus*. But ſays our Author, this does not prove, that there is but one *Mediator of Interceſſion*. But why does it not prove this? Is a Mediator of Interceſſion a Mediator? if he be, and there be but one Mediator, then there is

is but one Mediator of Interceſſion; for there is but one Mediator in all. As for his diſtinction between a Mediator of Redemption and Interceſſion, there is no ſuch diſtinction to be found in Scripture; and therefore when S. *Paul* aſſerts without any diſtinction, that there is but *one Mediator*, I think we have reaſon to do ſo too; for if we admit of unſcriptural diſtinctions, I know no Article of our Faith, but what may be diſtinguiſhed away.

When the Apoſtle ſays, There is but one God, why may not a Heathen diſtinguiſh upon this; That it is very true, there is but one Supreme and Sovereign God, though there are many inferior Deities; as well as a Papiſt ſay, That there is but one Mediator indeed of Redemption, but there may be many Mediators of Interceſſion? For both here, and in 1 *Cor.* 8. 5. The Apoſtle makes Chriſt the one Mediator, juſt as God is the one God, and that ſure ſignifies the only God, and the only Mediator. *For though there be, that are called Gods, whether in Heaven, or in Earth, (as there be Gods many, and Lords many) but to us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, and we by him.* Where, as one God is oppoſed to the multitude of Heathen Gods, ſo one Lord, or one Mediator (as *Baalim* and Lords ſignified, thoſe mediating powers between the Gods and Men.) is oppoſed to the many Lords and Mediators among the Heathens.

Indeed

Indeed as there is no foundation in Scripture for this diſtinction between a Mediator of Redemption and Interceſſion, ſo there is no ſenſe in it; for the office of a Mediator, conſidered as a Mediator, conſiſts wholly in Interceſſion; whence his authority and intereſt to intercede ariſes, is of another conſideration: and therefore S. *John* diſtinguiſhes between Chriſt's being *an Advocate for us*, and *a Propitiation for our ſins*, 1 John 2. 1, 2. *if any man ſin, we have an Advocate with the Father Jeſus Chriſt the righteous. And he is the Propitiation for our ſins.* Chriſt is our only Redeemer, who has bought us with his own Blood; but to be our Redeemer, and to be our Mediator and Advocate are two things: by the Conſtitution and Appointment of God both theſe are united in one perſon; that he who is our only Redemer, is our only Advocate alſo; but yet to redeem with his Blood, and to intercede with his Father for us, differ as the death of the Sacrifice doth from the interceſſion of the Prieſt. To Redeem and make Atonement for our ſins by ſhedding his Blood upon the Croſs, is not his Interceſſion for us; and to intercede for us in Heaven is not to redeem us by ſhedding his Blood, though he intercedes in vertue of his Blood. So that though Chriſt be our Redeemer, yet conſidered as our Mediator, and Advocate, his mediation conſiſts wholly in his Interceſſion for us: And therefore to ſay, that there

is one Mediator, and one Interceſſor is the very ſame thing. Suppoſe then the Apoſtle had ſaid, there is one God, and one Interceſſor between God and Men, *the man Chriſt Jeſus*; would this have proved, that there are no Mediators of Interceſſion but only Chriſt? Or would they ſtill ſay, that there is an Interceſſor of Redemption, and Interceſſors of Interceſſion, and yet that there is but one Interceſſor?

But beſides this, this very diſtinction between a Mediator of Redemption, and a Mediator of pure Interceſſion, that is, ſuch a Mediator as mediates in vertue of his Blood and Sacrifice, and a Mediator, who intercedes only by prayers, and perſonal intereſt and Merits, is contrary to the Analogy both of the Old and New Teſtament. For as there is no Remiſſion or Expiation, ſo there is no mediation without Blood. For to mediate and intercede is not merely to pray for another, but it ſignifies a Miniſterial authority to apply the vertues and merits of a Sacrifice.

Thus it was under the Law of *Moſes*: The High Prieſt was the Mediator, or as the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *every High Prieſt taken from among men, is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and Sacrifices for ſins.* Heb. 5, 1. Thus he mediates by offering Gifts and Sacrifices, by making Atonement and Expiation of ſin. And no Man has authority

rity to do this, but by God's Appointment. *No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron*, v. 4. Since there is no remiſſion of ſins without ſhedding Blood, without the Atonement and Expiation of Sacrifice; there can be no mediation but in vertue of the Sacrifice; and therefore there can be no Mediator, but he who offers the Sacrifice, which confines mediation to the Sacerdotal Office. And therefore if we have but one High Prieſt, there can be but one Mediator alſo between God and Man.

But that we may rightly apprehend this matter, and be able to diſtinguiſh betwen the prayers of good Men for themſelves and for each other, and the interceſſions of a Mediator, we muſt diſtinctly conſider the vertue of the Sacrifice, the prayers of the people, and the Interceſſion of the Prieſt, all which muſt concur to an effectual Prayer, to obtain our requeſts, and deſires of God. Thus it was in the Moſaical Law. The Sacrifice was ſlain inſtead of the ſinner, and to bear the puniſhment of ſin, and without ſhedding of blood there was no remiſſion. Prayers could not expiate ſin without a Sacrifice; and therefore even in the time of the Patriarchs an Altar, which is for Sacrifice, was the place of their Devotions. Thus *Noah*, as ſoon as he came out of the Ark built an Altar, and offered Sacrifice to God. Thus we frequently read, how *Abraham* in his Travels whereever Genes. 8. 20.

he made any ſtay, built an Altar unto the Lord,
Geneſ. 12 7,8. Ch. 26. 25. 35. and *called upon the name of the Lord*; that is, he offered Sacrifices and Prayers to God. The like we read of *Iſaac* and *Jacob*: So that an Altar was the place of their ſolemn Devotions; that is, they offered up their prayers to God in vertue of a Sacrifice. For ſinners muſt not go directly to God without the Atonement and Expiation of a Sacrifice.

Hence under the Law, while the Prieſt offered the Sacrifice, the people offered up their prayers to God to aſcend together with the Sacrifice; and therefore thoſe, who lived in places remote from *Jeruſalem*, which was the only place of Sacrifices; or thoſe who could not attend the daily Sacrifices in the Temple, yet were to obſerve the time of offering their Sacrifices, for the time of their Prayers: Whence it is that the time
Act. 3. 1. of offering the Sacrifice is called alſo, *the hour of Prayer*.

Thus the people were to offer a Sacrifice for ſin, and to offer up their prayers in vertue of the Sacrifice; but then neither their prayers nor their Sacrifice were acceptable to God, unleſs they were offered by the Prieſt: who ſprinkled the blood of the Sacrifice upon the Altar to make Atonement; and offered Incenſe as an emblem of their prayers: To which the Pſalmiſt
Pſal. 141. 1. alludes. *Let my prayer be ſet before thee as Incenſe; and the lifting up of my hands, as the evening Sacrifice.*

crifice. And therefore the Evangeliſt obſerves, that *the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of Incenſe*: that their prayers might aſcend as Incenſe. Luke 1. 10.

Thus we expreſly read in the Book of the Revelations, of *An Angel, who ſtood at the Altar, having a golden Cenſer, and there was given unto him much incenſe, that he ſhould offer it with the prayers of all Saints upon the golden Altar, which was before the Throne; and the ſmoke of the Incenſe, which came with the prayers of the Saints, aſcended before God out of the Angels hand.* Revel. 8. 3, 4.

Which expreſly applys theſe legal Types to the ſtate of the Goſpel, that great Sacrifice and great High Prieſt, who preſents our prayers to God. The death of Chriſt upon the Croſs was the Sacrifice for all our ſins; in vertue of this Sacrifice we pray to God; but Chriſt our great High Prieſt, is now aſcended into Heaven to preſent himſelf before his Father, to offer his own blood, and in vertue of that, to offer our prayers to him. This is the work of a Mediator and High Prieſt, not ſo much to pray for us, as to offer up our prayers to God, in the vertue and efficacy of his own Sacrifice, and with the authority of a heavenly Mediator and High Prieſt.

Now this plainly ſhows the difference between the prayers of good Men for themſelves and one another, and the Interceſſion of a Mediator.

Good

Good men are humble ſupplicants, but they offer up their prayers to God, not in their own name, but by the hands of their great High Prieſt, and in the merits of his Sacrifice; which is ſubordinate to the mediation of Chriſt, and as conſiſtent with it, as the prayers of the people under the Law were with the Atonement and Expiation made by the Prieſt, who offered the Blood of the Sacrifice, and the Incenſe to God. The work of a Mediator is to preſent our Prayers and Petitions, and to give value and efficacy to them, and therefore we muſt pray our ſelves, we muſt put up our Petitions to God, or our Advocate and Mediator cannot preſent them; but is it injurious to the Office of an Advocate, that we draw up a Petition, which he is to preſent to our King? So that the prayers of good Men for each other is no encroachment upon the Office of a Mediator; for our prayers for others, as well as for our ſelves muſt be offered to God by the hands of our Mediator.

And this ſhows alſo, that to deſire the prayers of good Men on Earth is no derogation from the Interceſſion of Chriſt: for we only deſire them to joyn with us in our Petition; juſt as if we ſhould procure ſome perſons of worth and note to ſubſcribe our Petition to our Prince, which is no injury to our Advocate, who preſents it. For they are two different things, to ſubſcribe a Petition, and to preſent it to our Prince.

And

And beſides this, a prayer, though it be the prayer of the beſt Man in the World, is but a prayer ſtill, and may be anſwered or rejected, as God ſees fit; but whatever prayer is preſented by our Mediator is always granted: For he mediates with authority, and power: *he is able to ſave to the uttermoſt all thoſe, that come unto God by him, ſeeing he ever liveth to make interceſſion for them.* Under the Law, the atonement and expiation of the Prieſt was always valid to all the intents and purpoſes of the Law, that is, to an external and legal purity; much more is the mediation of Chriſt effectual; for if it ever miſcarried, he could not be the object of our Faith and hope. A ſupplicant may heartily deſire our good; but our Mediator, by vertue of his office obtains all the petitions and prayers he preſents, and every body ſees, that theſe two are very conſiſtent. Hebr. 7. 25.

But though to deſire the prayers of good Men for us on Earth do not derogate from the Interceſſion of Chriſt; yet to flie to the aid of Saints in Heaven does. For that makes them our Advocates and Interceſſors, not our fellow Supplicants, whereas there is but one Mediator in Heaven, who appears in the preſence of God for us; as under the Law only the High Prieſt could enter into the Holy of Holies, which was a Type of Heaven, and did prefigure that great High Prieſt, who was to aſcend into Heaven with his own Blood.

See *Anſwer to Papiſts proteſting againſt Proteſtant Popery.*

I am

I am ſure the Church of *Rome* does not look upon the Saints in Heaven to be our fellow ſupplicants, as good Men on Earth are, but to be our Advocates and Interceſſors, and then they are Interceſſors in Heaven, where none but the High Prieſt was to intercede, and they are Interceſſors without a Sacrifice, which is contrary to the Analogy both of the Old and New Teſtament. For we have no more Interceſſors, than Prieſts; and we have but one High Prieſt, who is aſcended into Heaven, and appears in the preſence of God for us. And if interceſſion be annexed to the Prieſthood, I deſire to know, how the Virgin *Mary* comes to be ſo powerful a Mediatrix, and Advocatreſs; for we never heard of any ſhe-HighPrieſt before.

This is anſwer enough to what he intimates, that *deſiring the Interceſſions of the bleſſed is not more ſuperſtitious and derogatory to our Lord's Mediatorſhip, than intreating the Prayers of holy Men Militant*; For to pray for one another in this World is as conſiſtent with the mediation of Chriſt, as to pray for our ſelves; but the Interceſſions of Saints for us in Heaven is inconſiſtent with the only Mediatorſhip of Chriſt.

But praying to Saints in Heaven, which he modeſtly calls *Deſiring the Interceſſions of the bleſſed*, is of a different conſideration, and more injurious to God, than to a Mediator, conſidered only

only as our Mediator. For prayer is an act of worſhip peculiar and appropriate to God, and therefore not due to our Mediator himſelf, if he were not God. We muſt pray to God in the name of our Mediator, and preſent our Petitions to God by him, but if our Mediator were not God, we muſt not pray to him; and thus they are injurious to our only Mediator, when they pray to God in any other name, and expect to be heard for the ſake and merits of any other Mediator, but only Chriſt, as they always do on the Feſtivals of their Saints: but to pray to Saints alſo is an additional crime; it is giving the peculiar worſhip of God to creatures; which I told him was expreſly forbid by our Saviour, *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* But (ſays our Author) *I ſee not, how he can deduce from it* (this laſt Text) *any thing to his purpoſe, till it appear, that all Prayer is Divine worſhip, or that we pray to Saints juſt as we do to God.* But now methinks, till he make the contrary appear, it is very much to the purpoſe. For prayer is appropriated to God in Scripture, and all Mankind have thought prayer an act of religious worſhip, and have been able to diſtinguiſh between a religious prayer, and begging an Alms, or making any requeſt to our earthly Prince, or Parents, or Friends; and if our Author does not underſtand this, I have directed him in the Margin, where he may be better informed.

See the *Object of Religious worſhip, Part* 1. and the *Anſwer to Papiſts Proteſting againſt Proteſtant Popery*, Sect. 4.

XII. *Honouring the Croſs, the Reliques and Repreſentations of our Lord and his Saints, with that degree of Reverence, as we do the Goſpels, (commonly kiſſed and ſworn by) Altar, and other ſacred Utenſils is, Idolatry.*

This I told him was ill repreſented; for thoſe who charge them with Idolatry in worſhipping the Croſs, and Reliques, and Images, charge them alſo with giving more religious Honours and Worſhip to them, than that external reſpect, which we allow to the Goſpels, and religious Utenſils, as both the Decrees of their Councils, and the viſible practice of their Church proves.

Proteſtancy deſtitute of Scripture-Proofs, p. 8.

To this our Author replies. *Our general Councils tell Proteſtants we pay no other honour to any creature,* than what? than ſuch an external reſpect as is due to the Bible? I never heard before, that they made the Bible the object of their worſhip, but I am ſure ſome, which they call general Councils, have defined the Worſhip of Images and Reliques, witneſs the ſecond Council of *Nice*, and the Council of *Trent*. It is ſtrange to me, that at this time of day, he can think to impoſe upon Proteſtants with ſuch ſhams. Surely he has never read the *Doctrines and Practices of the Church of* Rome *truly repreſented*, the Anſwer to *Monſieur de Meaux*, or to *Papiſts Proteſting*

testing against Protestant Popery, nor the *Vindication of the Catechism truly representing the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of* Rome *in answer to the first and second Sheets, of the second Part, of the Papist Misrepresented and Represented.* Is our Author then one of those, who are employed some times to do a little job at Writing, but are not permitted to read any of our Books, but what and when their Superiors please? This gives an account of that Mystery how they can so confidently urge such things, as all the World now laughs at, for poor Men, they know no better; and what some so uncharitably call impudence, is only ignorance.

He proceeds. *Their Test and Homily call the honour we pay to sacred persons and things, Idolatry. We must either then challenge Protestants, to prove this proposition, or conclude them calumniators. We know, what we profess and practise to be as the Catholick Church teaches, we hear our Doctrine and Practice confidently said, and solemnly subscribed to be Idolatry. Sure then we may conclude, that Protestants believe the proposition, and decent it is, that they give a reason of a Faith so injurious to the Catholick Church, or henceforward renounce it.*

This still makes good my conjecture, that he has only heard in general of such a charge as this, but never read the Arguments, whereby some Protestants make good this charge, at least as they

apprehend: for me-thinks had he known theſe proofs, he ſhould firſt have anſwered them before he had called for more; but I aſſure him, it will be an eaſier task to conclude them Calumniators, than to undertake to anſwer them, and therefore if he be wiſe let him ſtick to that; if they believe and practiſe, as the Church of *Rome* teaches, (which in defiance of common ſence, he will call the *Catholick Church*) I am ſure they give another kind of honour to the Croſs, and Reliques and Images, than to the Bible; but if he thinks, that the Catholick Church always taught what the Church of *Rome* now teaches, I would deſire him to read a late Diſcourſe intituled; *The Antiquity of the Proteſtant Religion concerning Images*, which will better inform him.

But ſince he calls ſo importunately for proofs, it may be thought very uncivil to deny him; and therefore I ſhall briefly repreſent to him the reaſons, why ſome Proteſtants have charged the Church of *Rome* with Idolatry in worſhipping the Croſs, and Images, and ſhall be very glad for the ſake of the Church of *Rome* to ſee them well anſwered.

They lay their charge in the ſecond Commandment, which forbids the worſhip of Images, and all repreſentative objects, and ſay that the words are ſo large as to comprehend all manner of Images, which are ſet up for worſhip, that the Law expreſly forbids, without any diſtinc-

on

on of the end and intention of doing it, all external acts of adoration, as bowing down to them or before them: that it does not meerly forbid the worſhip of Images as Gods; for the Heathens themſelves were never ſo ſenſeleſs as to believe that their Images of Wood or Stone, or Silver or Gold, were Gods, but only viſible repreſentations of their inviſible Deities. That it does not only forbid the worſhip of the Images of Heathen Gods, but of the Lord *Jehovah*; for the reaſon whereby *Moſes* enforces this commandment is, that *they ſaw no ſimilitude on the day, that the Lord ſpake to them in Horeb out of the midſt of the fire*, Deut. 4. 15. and therefore they muſt *take good heed unto themſelves, leſt they corrupt themſelves with Images*: that they ſaw no Image of God is a good argument againſt their making and worſhipping the Image of the true God, but it is no direct argument againſt the Images of Heathen Gods; and therefore this muſt be a prohibition of worſhipping the true God by Images.

Another Scripture argument againſt Image-worſhip is from the infinite perfections and excellency of the Divine Nature, that no Image can be made of God, but what muſt be a reproach and debaſement of his Majeſty. *To whom then will ye liken God, or what likeneſs will ye compare to him*, &c. *Iſaiah* 40. 18, &c. and this ſurely is an argument againſt making and worſhipping any Image of the true God.

They

They conſider farther that *Aaron*'s Calf was not an Image of a falſe God, but a Symbolical repreſentation of the Lord *Jehovah*; For they expreſly call it, the God, which brought them out of the Land of *Egypt*, and when *Aaron* himſelf appointed a Feaſt for the Worſhip of this Molten God, He ſaid, *to morrow is a Feaſt to the Lord*, or to *Jehovah*, *Exod.* 32. 4, 5. and therefore theſe *Iſraelites* are charged, with *changing their glory*, (*i. e.* the Lord *Jehovah*, who was the Glory of *Iſrael*) *into the ſimilitude of an oxe, which eateth graſs*, *Pſalm.* 106. 20. But how can this be true, if they did not intend this Calf as a Repreſentation of the Lord *Jehovah*. And it is evident, that they made this Calf only as a Divine preſence to go before them in the abſence of *Moſes*; For *while Moſes delayed to come down out of the mount, the people gathered themſelves together unto Aaron, and ſaid unto him, Up, make us gods, which ſhall go before us: for as for this Moſes, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we know not what is become of him*, Verſe 1. So that they did not think of changing their God, but only wanted a Viſible and Symbolical preſence of God with them, inſtead of *Moſes*; who, when he was with them, was a kind of Divine preſence; God converſing familiarly with him, and by him giving them directions and orders what to do: and yet the worſhip of this Calf, which was not worſhipped as a God, or the Image of a falſe God,

but

but as a Symbolical Repreſentation of the Lord *Jehovah*, was Idolatry.

The like may be ſaid of the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel*, which *Jeroboam* ſet up in imitation of the golden Calf, and for Symbolical repreſentations of the God of *Iſrael*. For ſo he himſelf tells them, *Behold thy Gods, O Iſrael, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt*; that is, the Lord *Jehovah*, whom *Jeroboam* did ſtill own and Worſhip. For he had no intention to change their God, but only to prevent their going up to *Jeruſalem* three times in the Year to Worſhip there, according to the Law; which he feared might prove the deſtruction of his new Kingdom. And therefore God himſelf makes a great difference between the ſin of *Jeroboam* and the ſin of *Ahab*, who introduced the worſhip of *Baal*, a falſe God. And therefore though *Jehu* ſtill preſerved the golden Calves, which *Jeroboam* ſet up, yet he calls his Zeal in deſtroying *Baal*, his Zeal for the Lord *Jehovah*. Which is another Scripture-example of Idolatry in worſhipping the Image or Repreſentation of the True God.

1 Kings 12.28.

1 Kings 16, 31, 32.

2 Kings 10.16.

Another inſtance is the Brazen Serpent, which *Moſes* ſet up in the Wilderneſs, which was neither a God, nor the Image of any God, neither of the Lord *Jehovah*, nor of any Heathen God; and was not at firſt ſet up to be worſhipped, but only to be looked on by thoſe, who were ſtung with fiery Serpents; and was preſerved as a kind of

of holy Relique, as a laſting memorial of that deliverance God wrought for them by it. But when the Children of *Iſrael* burnt Incenſe to it, though they could intend to Worſhip no other God in it, but the Lord *Jehovah*, who gave it that miraculous Power, and could Worſhip it only as a memorative Sign of God's mighty Power, yet *Hezekiah* deſtroyed it, with the other Inſtruments of Idolatry, 2 *Kings* 18. 4. And yet I think I could make a much better Apologie for the Worſhip of the Brazen Serpent, than of the Croſs. For that was a Type of Chriſt crucified, a Type of God's own appointment, a miraculous and wonder-working Type, which I ſhould think ſhould as much deſerve to be worſhipped, as the Picture or Image of the Tree whereon our Saviour died. For if a memorative Sign of Chriſt deſerve ſuch Divine Honours, let them give me a reaſon, if they can, why the Type of a crucified Saviour ought not as much to be worſhipped by the *Jews* in thoſe days, as the Figure of Chriſt's Croſs now.

Thus the Proteſtants argue againſt the worſhip of Images from the *Second Commandment*, and from the Reaſons and Authorities of the *Old Teſtament*, and as for the *New Teſtament*, they can find no alteration made in this Law there: we are commanded indeed to keep our ſelves from Idols, but the Goſpel has given us no new notion of Idolatry, and therefore they reaſonably conclude, that what was Idolatry under the *Old Teſtament*, is ſo under the *New*. And indeed they look upon the *Second Commandment* as a natural

or

or moral Law, and ſuch Laws Chriſt neither did, nor could alter, no more than he could alter the Eternal Reaſons of things. For the Prohibition of Image-worſhip is founded in the Inviſibility, Purity, Spirituality, and immenſe Glory and Perfections of the Divine Nature, which cannot be repreſented by matter; and theſe Reaſons are as unchangeable as God is, and the Law muſt be as unchangeable as the Reaſons of it. And therefore we find theſe very Reaſons urged by St. *Paul* in the times of the Goſpel; *Foraſmuch as we are the Offspring of God, we ought not to think, that the Godhead is like unto Gold, or Silver, or Stone graven by Art, or man's device,* Acts 17. 29. Not as if the Heathens fancied, that their Gods were like the Images they worſhipped; for this is not only denied by their Philoſophers, but the very Nature of the thing ſhows it; for they worſhipped ſuch kind of Images, as it was impoſſible for them to conceive ſhould be the likeneſs of any God; not only the Images of Men, but unpoliſhed Stones, and Trees, Birds, and Beaſts, and creeping things; which they did not take to be Gods, nor the proper likeneſſes of their Gods, but ſymbolical Repreſentations of them; but the Apoſtles Argument is this, That it is a ridiculous thing to make any Image of God, when we cannot make any thing like him, as fooliſh a thing as it would be to paint a Sound; and that it is an affront to ſo glorious a Being, to repreſent him by that which is ſo very unlike him, and ſo infinitely unworthy of his Majeſty and Greatneſs. And though this Argument from the Inviſibility and Spirituality of the Divine Nature does not conclude againſt making the Images of Chriſt and his A-

Maximus Tyrius Diſſert. 38.

poſtles, who had the ſhape and figure of men, which might be painted or carved, no more than it did againſt many Images of Heathen Gods; moſt of whom were no better than dead Men and Women, yet it holds againſt the worſhip of any Image; for God alone, who is a pure and infinite Spirit, is the ſole Object of our religious Worſhip; and to worſhip God by an Image, is to reproach his Nature, and to debaſe him as low as matter; and to worſhip that which can be painted, is to worſhip a falſe Object; for Chriſt as God, and ſo only he is the Object of our Worſhip, cannot be painted; and to worſhip any material Image, though it be not made for the Supreme God, is yet a Reproach to the Divine Nature, as it ſignifies that ſomething which is divine, and a fit Object of our Adorations, may be repreſented by material Images and Pictures.

But the Proteſtants conſider farther, that if the Worſhip of Images was forbid by the Law of *Moſes*, it muſt needs be much more contrary to the Goſpel of our Saviour, which has leſs to do with Matter and Senſe, than the Law had. Our Saviour tells us, That *God is a Spirit, and thoſe who worſhip him, muſt worſhip him in Spirit and in Truth*, in oppoſition to the external, and typical, and figurative Worſhip of the Law; and if this typical Worſhip which was allowed when the Worſhip of Images was forbid, be now abrogated as leſs pure and ſpiritual, they think it very ſtrange, that the Worſhip of Images, which is the moſt groſs and material, and unmanly Worſhip that can be invented, ſhall be allowed under the ſpiritual ſtate of the Goſpel.

And

And there is one Argument to this purpoſe, which I would deſire our Author ſeriouſly to conſider, *viz.* That there is no material Temple in the Chriſtian Church, much leſs Statues and Images; for the underſtanding of which, we muſt conſider what notions the Heathens had of their Temples, what notion the *Jews* had of it, and that there is no ſuch Temple in the Chriſtian Church.

As for the Heathens, their Temples were the Houſes of their Gods, where they dwelt, and were confined, and ſhut up by ſome Magical Spells and Charms, as the Images of their Gods were faſtned there, that they might be always preſent to attend the Sacrifices and Worſhip of their Votaries: For they did not believe that their Gods were omnipreſent, and therefore they confined their preſence to Temples and Images, that they might know where to find them. Their Temples were the places where they kept the Statues and Images of their Gods, to whom ſuch Temples were dedicated, and where they believed ſuch Gods dwelt: according to that of *Menander*;

———τὸν δίκαιον δεῖ θεὸν
Οἴκοι μένειν σώζοντα τοὺς ἱδρυμένους.

That a juſt and righteous God muſt tarry at home to defend thoſe who placed him there. This *Origen* gives an account of in his third and ſeventh Book againſt *Celſus*, and the thing is ſo known, that I need not prove it, a Temple and an Image in the Heathen Theology were inſeparably united; an Image to repreſent their God, a Temple as a Houſe for him to dwell in, and where they might be ſure to find him.

Under the Jewiſh Law God ſo far condeſcended to the weakneſs of that People, as to a have viſible Preſence among them; firſt in the Tabernacle, and then in the Temple at *Jeruſalem*; but though he had his Temple, yet he had no Image, which the Heathen World thought eſſential to a Temple. For though a ſymbolical Preſence was no confinement of God, nor injurious to his Majeſty, yet a material Image was: And yet *Solomon* in his Prayer of Dedication, took care to prevent the Heathen notion of a Temple, as if God were confined to it; for he owns his Omnipreſence, that he fills both Heaven and Earth; only he prays, that he would have a more particular regard to that place, and to thoſe Prayers which ſhould be offered up there; 1 *Kings* 8. 27, 28, &c. *But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold the Heaven, and Heaven of Heavens cannot contain thee, how much leſs this houſe that I have builded? Yet have thou reſpect unto the Prayer of thy Servant, and to his Supplication, O Lord, my God, to hearken unto the cry, and to the Prayer which thy Servant prayeth before thee this day: That thine eyes may be open to this Houſe night and day*, &c.

And therefore we may obſerve, that the Temple was ſo contrived as to be a figure of the whole world. For the Holy of Holies was a figure of Heaven into which the High Prieſt entered once a year, *Heb.* 9. 24. and therefore the reſt of the Temple ſignified this earth, and the daily worſhip and Service of it; which plainly ſignified to them, that that God who dwelt in the Temple, was not confined to that material Building, but filled Heaven and Earth with his Preſence, though he was pleaſed to have a more peculiar

culiar regard to that place, and to the Prayers and Sacrifices which were offered there. And yet it ſeems that God would not ſo far have indulged them at that time, as to confine his Worſhip and peculiar Preſence to a certain place, had it not been for the ſake of ſome more Divine Myſtery. For Gods Symbolical and Figurative Preſence in the Tabernacle and Temple was only a Type of the Incarnation of the Son of God, of his dwelling among us in a humane Body or material Temple, as St. *John* plainly intimates 1 *John* 14. *The word was made fleſh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of Grace and Truth*; ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, he Tabernacled among us; dwelt among us as God under the Law did in the Tabernacle or Temple; and Chriſt expreſly calls his Body the Temple 2. *John* 19. *Deſtroy this Temple, and in three days I will raiſe it up*, which the Evangeliſt tells us, *he ſpake of the Temple of his Body*, 21. v. and he affirms himſelf to be greater than the Temple 12. *Matth.* 6. he being that in Truth of which the Temple was a Figure; God dwelling among us, God dwelling in human Nature. For this Reaſon the Worſhip of God was confined to the Temple at *Jeruſalem*, to ſignifie to us that we can offer up no acceptable Worſhip to God, but in the Name and Mediation of Chriſt.

But now under the Goſpel all theſe Types and Figures being accompliſhed in the Perſon of our Saviour; as their Prieſthood and Sacrifices, ſo their Temple alſo had an end; as Chriſt expreſly tells the Woman of *Samaria*, who diſputed with him about the place of Worſhip, whether it were the

the Temple at *Jeruſalem* or *Samaria*; *Woman believe me, the hour cometh when ye ſhall neither in this Mountain, nor yet at* Jeruſalem *Worſhip the Father*, John 4. 21. which cannot ſignifie that they ſhould Worſhip God neither at *Jeruſalem* nor *Samaria*, for there were famous Churches planted by the Apoſtles at both theſe places, where they Worſhipped God in Spirit and in Truth; but it ſignifies that there ſhould be no material Temple, that the Preſence of God ſhould not be confined to a certain place, as then it was to the Temple; which occaſioned that Diſpute between the *Jews* and *Samaritanes*, in which Temple God was perculiarly preſent; but whereſoever they Worſhipped God in Spirit and in Truth, the place ſhould make no difference in their Acceptation, as it did under the Law; which is not oppoſed to the erecting of decent and ſeparate places of Worſhip under the Goſpel, but only to the Notion of a Temple.

That this was the ſenſe of the Primitive Chriſtians, that they had no material Temples, as the Heathens had, is evident from their Writings; for the Heathens made this objection againſt them, that they had no Temples nor Images; which is owned and anſwered by *Origen* againſt *Celſus lib.* 8. *Minutius Fælix*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*:

The force then of the Argument is this, If under the Goſpel God does not allow of ſo much as a Temple or Symbolical Preſence, which he did allow of under the Law, when he forbad Images, much leſs certainly does he allow Images now, which he forbad under the Law. But Proteſtants have

have another Argument to prove, that the Worſhip of Images is forbid by the Goſpel as well as by the Law; and that is, that the Primitive Church always underſtood it ſo, as is evident from the Writings of the Ancient Fathers, who condemned the Worſhip of Images, and urged ſuch Arguments againſt it in their Diſputes with the Heathens, as had eaſily been retorted upon themſelves had they practiſed the ſame thing; and yet this was never objected againſt them by their wittieſt Adverſaries in that Age, though when Image Worſhip began to be introduced into the Church, it was preſently objected againſt the Chriſtians both by Jews and Heathens; and which is more than this, beſides all the other Arguments which they uſed, they alleadged the Second Commandment as the Reaſon, why they could not Worſhip Images, which is a certain Proof, that they then thought the Second Commandment was ſtill in force. But I ſhall not enlarge upon this, becauſe it is ſo well done in a late Diſcourſe concerning the Antiquity of the Proteſtant Religion, Part 2. concerning Images to which I refer my Reader.

13. *The Pope is Antichriſt.*

I anſwered, *This has been affirmed by ſome Proteſtants, but is no Article of our Church, and therefore we are not bound to prove it, but when we have a mind to it. No Man ever pretended that there is any ſuch Propoſition in Scripture, as that the Pope is Antichriſt, but ſome think, that the Characters of Antichriſt and the Man of Sin, are much more applicable to him than the Univerſal Headſhip and Infalibility.* Anſwer to Requeſt. p. 12.

To

To this our Author anſwers (p. 8.) *Do only ſome Proteſtants, and no Homily (ſubſcribed as containing a Godly and wholſom Doctrine, neceſſary for theſe times, Article the Fifty fifth)* though the Church of *England* owns but Thirty nine Articles; *affirm the Pope to be Antichriſt? Yet we meet with no Scripture brought to prove this Godly neceſſary Doctrine.*

Now though I could tell him, that every ſaying in an Homily has not the Authority of an Article, yet I need not enter into that Diſpute; for I am pretty confident it is no where expreſly aſſerted in any of our Homilies, that the Pope is Antichriſt. The moſt that looks that way, is in the Second Part of the Homily for *Whitſunday*; where from their oppoſition to ſome Goſpel Doctrine, and preferring their own Decrees before the expreſs Word of God, it is proved, that, *they are not of Chriſt, nor yet poſſeſſed with his Spirit.* From their Pride and Arrogance in challenging an Univerſal Headſhip, and advancing themſelves above Soveraign Princes, or in the Scripture Phraſe, *above all that is called God,* and treating Emperors and Kings with the greateſt inſolence and ſcorn: Our Church concludes, that they had not the Spirit of God, but the Spirit of the Devil; *that whereſoever ye find the Spirit of Arrogancy and Pride, the Spirit of Envy, Hatred, Contention, Cruelty, Murder, Extortion, Witchcraft, Necromancy,* &c. *aſſure your ſelves, that there is the Spirit of the Devil and not of God; albeit they pretend outwardly to the World never ſo much Holineſs,* that ſuch wicked Popes as theſe *are worthily accounted among the number of falſe Prophets and falſe Chriſts*; ſo that at moſt the Homily does but reckon theſe Popes

Popes in the number of false Christs, but does not make the Pope the *Antichrist*. It concludes with a Prayer, *That God by the comfortable Gospel of his Son would beat down Sin, Death, the Pope, the Devil, and all the Kingdom of Antichrist*; where I confess the Pope is put in very ill Company, and a fair intimation given that he may have some relation to the Kingdom of Antichrist, but yet he is not expressly called Antichrist.

And therefore as for his demand of Scripture Proof, let him seek for it in those Writers who expressly affirm the Pope to be Antichrist; where it may be he will find more than he will like, or can easily answer. I told him before that the Scripture does not expressly name who is Antichrist, or the Man of Sin, but gives such Characters of him, as some think the Pope of *Rome* has the best claim to: It is enough for us to know, that he usurps such an Authority as Christ never gave him, preaches such Doctrines as Christ never taught, encourages such Actions as are contrary to the true Spirit of the Gospel; and that is reason enough for us to reject him.

14. Every Prayer used in Divine Offices, must be in a Language vulgar and intelligible to every Auditor. For the Proof of this I alleadged St. *Paul*'s Discourse, 1. *Cor.* 14. and must now consider what he tell us is the Apostles mind in it, viz. *that whoever had the gift of a Tongue strange to all the Auditory, should forbear to dictate therein Extempore Sermons, Prayers, &c. containing matter, as well as the Tongue inspired into the Speaker: I say this gift (of no use, but used for ostentation in such a case) was to* Prot. dest. p. 9.

be reſerved till either the Speaker or ſome Auditor could and did interpret, that the reſt might edifie. Now will it follow from hence, that all the ſettled Forms of Divine Offices (to many of which there is no neceſſity, that all ſpecially joyn and intend) be in the vulgar, or intelligible to every Auditor? It is enough (to comply with the Apoſtles Doctrine) that all new Extempore Prayers, and Inſtructive or Exhortatory Diſcourſe (by Actions, Ceremonies, or Circumſtances, or other way not interpretable) be, as they are, in the Vulgar. But for the fixt Forms of Divine Offices, that they be in a Language the moſt certain and the moſt intelligible, not only in Chriſtendom, but in every Auditory. Intelligible I ſay, where needful, to every one by either Actions, Ceremonies, and Circumſtances, or by Cuſtom, Affinity with the Vulgar, or Books intepreting and containing Prayers correſpondent to every part, wherein the Auditory is concerned.

I have Tranſcribed the whole, becauſe it is as choice a Paragraph as we ſhall ordinarily meet with. The only difficulty I ſee in it, is to know at which end to begin to anſwer, for if I underſtand him, the beginning and concluſion of this Paragraph do not well agree. In the beginning he would confine the Apoſtles Diſcourſe againſt Prayers in an unknown Tongue, *to inſpired and extempore Prayers and Sermons*, but that notwithſtanding this, the ſetled Forms of Divine Offices may be in an unknown Tongue; in the coucluſion he would fain inſinuate, that though the Publick Offices of the Church of *Rome* be in Latin, which is not the Vulgar Tongue now in any Nation,

Nation, yet they are *in a Language the moſt certain and the moſt intelligible, not only in Chriſtendom but in every Auditory.* It ſeems he had ſome little Qualm came over his Conſcience, ſome ſecret Convictions that Men ought to underſtand their Prayers; and therefore he roundly aſſerts, that Latin is the moſt intelligible Language, that is, the moſt known and beſt underſtood of any Language in Chriſtendom, and to every Auditory. Now if this be ſo, what need all this Diſpute about Service in an unknown Tongue? what need of diſtinguiſhing between extempore Prayers, and ſetled Forms of Divine Offices? we are all it ſeems agreed, that Publick Prayers ought to be in an intelligible Language, and that which is intelligible to every Auditor; the only difference is whether Latin be as well underſtood in all the Auditories in *England*, as Engliſh is.

Well, but this is a very great Riddle, and requires ſome skill to make it out; for our Engliſh Auditories believe themſelves that they do not underſtand Latin, but they may be miſtaken for ought any body knows; let us than ſee how our Author makes it out, *Intelligible, I ſay, where needful, to every one by either Actions, Ceremonies, and Circumſtances, or by Cuſtom, Affinity with the Vulgar, or Books interpreting, and containing Prayers correſpondent to every part, wherein the Auditory is concerned*; that is, as we uſe to ſay, you muſt know their meaning by their gaping; and thus forſooth, Latin is a very intelligible Language to thoſe who do not underſtand one word of it. What ſhuffling and trifling is this! do the People underſtand Latin

Prayers, or do they not? if they don't, then the Service is performed in an unknown Tongue to them, which St. *Paul* expreſly condemns; and whatever they underſtand about the Buſineſs, yet they do not underſtand their Prayers; which is the Diſpute between us: If theſe dumb Signs can teach People their Prayers, then it is lawful for them, it ſeems, to know their Prayers, and then why may they not pray in a Language which they underſtand? for Words are more expreſſive of Thoughts, than Actions, and Ceremonies, and Circumſtances can be, which can only tell in general what we are about, not what we ſay; and as for Books to interpret our Prayers, what need we go ſo far about? Why may we not pray in the Vulgar Tongue as well as interpret Prayers in a Vulgar Tongue? And what ſhall thoſe do who have no Books and cannot read? This is direct Boys play, to make an offer of giving ſomething, but to pull back your hand if any one offers to take it.

Let us then conſider, how he can adjuſt this Matter with St. *Paul*; and the ſum of what he ſays is this, that St. *Paul* only forbids Inſpired and Extempore Prayers in an unknown Tongue, where there is no body to interpret, but the ſetled Forms of Divine Offices may be in an unknown Tongue for all that. This is certainly as little as can be ſaid, and as little to the purpoſe; for whoever conſiders the place, will find that all the Apoſtles Arguments are againſt an unknown Tongue, for this very Reaſon, becauſe it is unknown and not underſtood; and then if we muſt not uſe an unknown Tongue in Religious Worſhip, we muſt not uſe an unknown Tongue

Tongue in our ſetled and ordinary Devotions. There are three Arguments the Apoſtle uſes, which I think, will reach our ordinary Devotions, as well as inſpired Gifts. 1. That it is contrary to the Edification of the Church. 2. That it contradicts the natural uſe of ſpeaking. 3. That it is contrary to the nature and end of Prayer.

1. It is contrary to the Edification of the Church. *Now, Brethren, if I come unto you, ſpeaking with Tongues, what ſhall I profit you, except I ſhall ſpeak to you either by Revelation, or by Knowledge, or by Prophecying, or by Doctrine?* That is, unleſs I ſpeak ſomething to you, which you can underſtand, and which may inform your Judgment; as he adds, *In the Church I had rather ſpeak five words with my Underſtanding, that by my voice I might teach others alſo, than ten thouſand words in an unknown Tongue.* Now if theſe extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit were to be valued and uſed only for the Edification of the Church, and to ſpeak to the Inſtruction of others, is to be preferred before ſpeaking in an unknown Tongue by Inſpiration; then certainly the ordinary Service and Worſhip of God, which is inſtituted on purpoſe for the Edification of the Church, muſt be in a known Tongue, when the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit themſelves muſt give place to Edification. For if the Apoſtle would have made any exception, methinks he ſhould have excepted theſe extraordinary Gifts: For one would think, whenever the holy Spirit inſpires men, they ought to ſpeak whatever Language it be in: for it ſeems ſtrange, that any man ſhould forbid theſe to ſpeak, whom the Spirit inſpires; and yet we ſee the Exerciſe of theſe

1 Cor. 14. 6. 19.

theſe Gifts were reſtrained to make them ſerviceable to the Church, and not to be for meer Pomp and Oſtentation. But for men, who have no pretence to any ſuch Inſpiration, to affect to ſpeak in an unknown Tongue that they may not be underſtood, is to deprive the Church of the Edification of Religious Offices, without any pretence for doing ſo.

2. To ſpeak in an unknown Tongue, contradicts the natural end and uſe of Speech. *For even things without life giving ſounds, whether Pipe or Harp, except they give a diſtinction in the ſounds, how ſhall it be known what is piped or harped? For if the Trumpet give an uncertain ſound, who ſhall prepare himſelf to the Battel? So likewiſe you, except ye utter by the Tongue words eaſie to be underſtood, how ſhall it be known what is ſpoken, for ye ſhall ſpeak into the Air? There are, it may be, ſo many kinds of Voices in the World, and none of them without ſignification: therefore if I know not the meaning of the Voice, I ſhall be unto him that ſpeaketh a Barbarian, and he that ſpeaketh ſhall be a Barbarian unto me.* Is this Argument only againſt inſpired Tongues, or againſt the uſe of all unknown Tongues, among Perſons who do not underſtand them? For this relates to the uſe of Speech in common Converſation, as well as in the Offices of Religion; and if Speech was given us to communicate our Thoughts to each other; if it be ſo vain, and abſurd, and uſeleſs a thing to talk to men in a Tongue which they do not underſtand, it is much more abſurd in Religion, which does more ſtraitly oblige us to mutual Edification. For the uſe of words even in Prayer, is not for the ſake of God, but men. God knows our thoughts, and therefore a mental

Verſ. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.

a mental Prayer is as acceptable to him without vocal words; but the uſe of words is either to affect our ſelves, and then they muſt be ſuch words as we our ſelves underſtand; or to direct others in the matter and form of their Prayers, and then they muſt be ſuch words as they underſtand; or to unite the Affections and Deſires of the whole Congregation at the ſame time in the ſame Petitions, which is eſſential to publick Worſhip; and then they muſt be ſuch words as we all underſtand; but to ſpeak words which no body underſtands, is to ſpeak to no purpoſe, which is abſurd in common Converſation, but profane in Religion.

3ly. Another Argument St. *Paul* uſes againſt an unknown Tongue, is, That it is contrary to the nature of Prayer and religious Worſhip, which muſt be a reaſonable Service, and therefore requires the exerciſe of the Underſtanding, as well as Affections. *For if I pray in an unknown Tongue, my Spirit prayeth, but my underſtanding is unfruitful. What is it then, I will pray with the ſpirit, and will pray with the Underſtanding alſo; I will ſing with the Spirit, and I will ſing with the Underſtanding alſo. Elſe when thou ſhalt bleſs with the Spirit, how ſhall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned* (that is, every ordinary Chriſtian, who has not this gift of Tongues, or of interpreting Tongues; for there were no Clarks in thoſe days to ſay Amen for the whole Congregation) *ſay Amen at thy giving of thanks, ſeeing he underſtandeth not what thou ſayeſt?* And if the Exerciſe of ſupernatural Gifts themſelves, which the Apoſtle ſeems here to call praying by the Spirit, be not an acceptable Worſhip to God, without the acts of our Reaſon and Underſtanding, certainly an unknown Tongue Verſ. 14, 15, 16.

Tongue is much more unjuſtifyable in our ordinary Devotions. If the whole Congregation muſt ſay *Amen* to thoſe Prayers which are offered to God, and it be a ludicrous thing to ſay *Amen* to what we do not underſtand, then whether the Prayers be inſpired, or compoſed, it is neceſſary that the whole Congregation ſhould underſtand them.

But our Author (though very timerouſly) inſinuates an Anſwer or two to this one Reaſon, why he thinks *the ſetled Forms of Divine Offices* are tacitely excepted by the Apoſtle, and need not be performed *in the vulgar, and intelligible to every Auditor*, comes in in a Parentheſis, and indeed was as fit for a Parentheſis as any thing could be; for he will preſently ſee, that it might have been ſpared. *To many of which* (Divine Offices) *there is no neceſſity that all ſpecially joyn and intend*: By which I ſuppoſe he means, that there are ſeveral Offices in the Church of *Rome*, which People are not bound to attend to, nor joyn in, and therefore there is no need they ſhould underſtand them.

1. Now in the firſt place, I deſire to know why there ſhould be any ſuch Divine Offices in publick Worſhip, which the People are not bound to joyn in? Methinks the Apoſtle's Argument againſt ſpeaking in an unknown Tongue, becauſe it is contrary to Edification, holds as well, and for the ſame Reaſon, againſt ſuch Offices as theſe, which certainly are not much for Edification, when People are not bound to joyn in them; unleſs every thing in publick Worſhip muſt be done for Edification, and therefore muſt be underſtood by the People who are to be edified by it, the Apoſtles Argument againſt theſe inſpired

inſpired Tongues is not good; for if our Author had been preſent when St. *Paul* wrote this, he could have eaſily anſwered him, that there was no need that the whole Congregation ſhould underſtand theſe inſpired Men; but let thoſe underſtand who could, and if no body underſtood it, what hurt did it do? Nay, the Exercise of ſuch extraordinary Gifts did edifie thoſe who ſaw and heard, though they did not underſtand; and when the Spirit inſpires men to ſpeak in unknown Tongues, we have reaſon to think, that the Spirit did not intend that every one ſhould underſtand them; and that is reaſon to believe, that the exerciſe of ſuch Gifts was very fitting, though they were not underſtood. Let our Author try now how he can juſtifie St. *Paul*'s Argument againſt unknown, though inſpired Tongues, upon the Principle which he has laid down, That the People are not bound to joyn in all the Offices of publick Worſhip; That any thing may be done in publick Worſhip, which is not for publick Edification: or let him try if he can ſay half ſo much for ſuch *ſetled Forms of Divine Offices*, as People are not bound to joyn in, and therefore not bound to underſtand, as may be pleaded for the occaſional Exerciſe of miraculous and inſpired Gifts in an unknown Tongue: and if he can't, then this Anſwer he gives about ſuch Offices as People are not bound to joyn in, is a better Anſwer to St. *Paul*, than it is to Proteſtants, a much better Vindication of the Exerciſe of ſuch unknown Tongues, than of the uſe of Latine Service where Latine is an unknown Tongue.

For, ſecondly, I would ask our Author, whether there be any Offices of Religion, which People are bound to attend to, and to joyn in? His ſaying, That *there are many*, which they are not bound to attend to, ſuppoſes, that there are ſome, which they are bound to attend to, and to joyn in; and his making this an Argument for Service in an unknown Tongue, that there are many Offices, which they are not bound to attend to, and therefore not to underſtand; (for there muſt be the force of his Argument, if it have any) ſuppoſes, that they muſt underſtand what they muſt attend to, and joyn in: how then does this juſtifie the *Latine* Service of the Church of *Rome*? For their whole Service is in *Latine*, an unknown Tongue; and therefore according to his Reaſon, the People are not bound to attend to, or joyn in any part of their Worſhip, becauſe they underſtand none of it. And is not that a pretty kind of publick Worſhip, which no body is bound to attend to, or joyn in? not the Prieſt himſelf, when he does not underſtand *Latin*, which, as they ſay, too often happens in Catholick Countries.

3ly. Since our Author ſays, That there are only *many*, not *all* Divine Offices, which the People are not bound to joyn in, he would have done well to have given us ſome mark of diſtinction, that we might have known what Offices People muſt joyn in, and what not. For I cannot for my life think of any Act of publick Chriſtian Worſhip, which all Chriſtians are not bound to joyn in. I ſhould think it very convenient, that all Chriſtians ſhould attend to, and joyn in the holy Sacraments when they are adminiſtred; for if they muſt not bear their parts there

there (which must be their own Act, or it signifies nothing, it being a making and renewing a soleman Vow and Covenant with God) to be sure they can be concerned in nothing else: And therefore the Offices of Baptism and the Lords Supper, ought to be administred in the vulgar Tongue, that every Body may understand them.

Thus, if men are bound to pray to God, and to praise him, surely they are bound to joyn in publick Prayers and Praises; and then according to this Rule, the publick Prayers and Hymns of the Church ought to be in the vulgar Tongue. And I cannot imagine a Reason why the People ought not to attend to reading the Lessons, the Epistles, and Gospels; for I know no other use of reading them, but that the People might hear, and understand them, and be edified by them; and then they also should be in the vulgar Tongue. In short, there is nothing is an Office of Religion, but what the People are concerned in, and therefore must attend to it, and joyn in it, unless it be not their Duty to attend to, and joyn in the Worship of God: And therefore our Author by insinuating this Principle, That People must understand what they are bound to attend to, and joyn in, (which is so agreeable to common sense, that he could not resist it) has effectually overthrown and condemned the *Latine* Service, unless he can prove, that People are not concerned to joyn in the Worship of God; and then I desire to know why they must be present at it?

4. But suppose, as he says, that there were no *necessity* that all should *specially joyn, and attend* to all religious Offices, yet were it not better, that they

ſhould? Were it not more for the Edification of the Church, and of every particular Chriſtian, that they ſhould underſtand their Prayers, and all joyn in the ſame Petitions, with the ſame devout Affections, than that they ſhould only gaze upon the Prieſt, and be not Worſhippers, but meer Spectators of religious Worſhip? Now if it be better to underſtand our Prayers, than not to underſtand them, to offer up a reaſonable, than unreaſonable Service to God; if it be better to worſhip God, than meerly to ſee him worſhipped; then how can he juſtifie Service in an unknown Tongue? For when the Apoſtle diſputes againſt ſpeaking with unknown Tongues, the Argument whereon he founds the unlawfulneſs of it, is, That it is againſt Edification; and this Argument muſt hold againſt *Latine* Service, unleſs Ignorance edifies more than Knowledge; which I believe at this time of day our Author will not care to ſay.

Secondly, His next Anſwer is what I before took notice of; That the People do underſtand their Prayers, though they be in *Latine*. The meaning of which, is no more but this; That by frequent attendance at Maſs, and obſerving the Actions and Ceremonies uſed by the Prieſt, ſome of them underſtand whereabout the Prieſt is, and what he is a doing: they know, when they hear the Bell, and ſee the Elevation of the Hoſt, that they muſt fall down and worſhip, *&c.* but do not underſtand one word that is ſaid. But this is only to underſtand the Actions and Ceremonies, not the words; and cannot anſwer the end of publick Prayer, which is to offer up our common Petitions to God with one Heart and Mind. The uſe of words in publick Prayer, is to direct

direct and determine our Thoughts, and to excite our Affections; for this Reason the Priest reads the Prayers with an audible Voice, that all the People may joyn with him, and these indeed are Publick and Common Prayers; but now in the Church of *Rome* the Priest reads the Prayers, but the People do not joyn with him, because they do not understand him; but the most they can do is by Actions and Ceremonies, to guess at what part of the Service he is, and either only look on, or if they be very Devout, entertain themselves with some good Pious Thoughts, or put up some private Prayers to God, or it may be to the Virgin *Mary*, or some Saint, while the Priest is saying Mass; and thus the Priest prays by himself, and the People, if they do pray, pray by themselves, and have no other Benefit of the Publick Offices of the Church, but only to see what the Priest does, which at best can only fill them with some Religious Amusements, or with confused, and indistinct, and Enthusiastick Devotions. It is plain, that in the Church of *Rome*, the Devotions of the People are left to their own Extempore Conceits, which is a thousand times worse than the Extempore Prayers of the Preachers, who may be Men of Parts and Learning, and able to suggest very Proper Petitions, and very Pious Thoughts, and to excite very Devout Passions in their Hearers; and is it not very odd that the Church should have *settled Forms of Divine Offices*, Composed Forms of Prayer and Praise, and yet the People, who will pray, must be left to their Extempore Devotions; is this also for the Edification of the Church? Is not this Fanaticism with a Witness.

To

To conclude this Argument, I know no practiſe in the World more directly contrary to the ſenſe of all Mankind than Prayers in an unknown Tongue. There was no Nation, nor no Religion in the World ever profeſſedly guilty of it, but the Church of *Rome*; and there can be no Reaſon imaginable why they ſhould conceal their Worſhip, unleſs they are aſhamed of it, or ſuſpect that no diſintereſted Man can like it when he knows it; and it is as odd a Task to prove that Men muſt underſtand their Prayers, as it would be to prove that the uſe of Speech is to be underſtood.

15. *A Company of Chriſtians voluntarily ſeparating from all other Chriſtian Societies, condemning their Doctrines and Rites, deſtitute alſo of any viſible correſpondence with them in the Euchariſt, in any Religious Aſſemblies or Solemn Devotions; can, notwithſtanding this perverſe, intire, and manifeſt Separation be a Myſtical Member of Chriſt in Catholick Unity, and a Charitable part of the Catholick Church.*

Anſwer to Requeſt. p. 13.

In anſwer to this I told him, that *if he applies this to us, it is manifeſtly falſe; for though we do not Communicate with the Church of* Rome *in her corrupt Worſhip, yet there are many Chriſtian Churches with which we can and do Communicate; and ſeparate our ſelves no farther from any Society of Chriſtians, than they ſeparate themſelves from the Primitive and Apoſtolick Church; that if the Church of* England *be a true Apoſtolick Church in Faith, and Worſhip, and Government, and ſeparates from other Churches only upon account of ſuch Corruptions as will juſtifie a ſeparation, what ſhould hinder her from being a Myſtical Member of Chriſt, in Catholick Unity,*

ty, and a Charitable part of the Catholick Church? for a true Apoſtolick Faith and Worſhip does certainly make us the Myſtical Members of Chriſts Body, or elſe I deſire to know what does? That Catholick Unity is not violated by a juſt ſeparation, and dangerous Corruptions in Faith and Worſhip are a juſt cauſe of ſeparation. Come out from among them, and, be ye ſeparate, ſaith the Lord; and touch not the unclean thing and I will receive you 2 *Cor* 6.17.

Proteſtancy deſtitute of Scripture Proofs. p. 10.

All that our Author replies to this is, that *This Propoſition relates to matter of Fact, which we affirm Proteſtants to have done, and deſire them to make out by Scripture the Lawfulneſs of it, and its conſiſtency with Catholick Unity and Charity.* But I denied that we had done this, and gave him in ſhort my Reaſons why I denied it, which methinks might have deſerved ſome notice: and as for our ſeparation from the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*, that I gave him my Reaſons for, and ſuch as, it ſeems, he had no mind to anſwer; that ſeparation might ſometimes be lawful and neceſſary, and therefore not chargeable with Schiſm, nor a breach of Catholick Unity, I proved from the Text now quoted. *Come out from among them*, &c. to which he ſays, *If I intend this for a Proof, then it muſt import that it is the Duty of one Chriſtian, or a Party pretending to be a National Church to come out of the Catholick Church, and be ſeparate from her; leſs than this will not reach the Proteſtant Caſe, and ſo much as this will by no means agree with one Holy Church, wherein alone the Communion of Saints, Remiſſion of Sins, and Life Everlaſting are to be found.*

But

But how is this the Proteſtant Caſe? How does ſeparation from the Church of *Rome*, and that no farther neither than ſhe is Corrupt, come to be a ſeparation from the Catholick Church? He knows that we deny the Church of *Rome* to be the Catholick Church, and we know that he can never prove it to be ſo; and whatever Church or Churches have corrupted the Faith and Worſhip of Chriſt, we ſhall make no ſcruple at all to ſeparate from them in ſuch Corruptions, and have the whole Goſpel to juſtifie us in it; for in ſuch Caſes we are under the ſame obligation to ſeparate, that we are to profeſs the true Faith, and practiſe the true Worſhip of Chriſt.

All that can be charged upon the Church of *England* is, that ſhe renounced the Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, and denied Obedience and Subjection to that See, which never had any Divine Right to claim it: and that ſhe reformed thoſe Errors in Doctrine, and Corruptions in Worſhip, which ſhe formerly was guilty of. This charge we readily own, but deny that this is Schiſm of Separation from the Catholick Church.

For till our Author can prove that the Unity of the Catholick Church conſiſts in ſubjection to the Biſhop of *Rome*, it is ridiculous to charge us with breaking Catholick Unity, by denying that Obedience which we do not owe; and when he can prove this eſſential to Catholick Unity to ſubmit to the Biſhop of *Rome*, as the viſible Head of the Church, we will own our ſelves to be Schiſmaticks. But then I muſt mind him what he is to prove, *viz.* that by a Divine Inſtitution the Biſhop of *Rome* is

the

the viſible Head of Unity, to whom all Churches muſt ſubmit, for nothing can be eſſential to the Unity of the Church but what Chriſt himſelf has made ſo; and what is not abſolutely eſſential may be changed and altered, when there is abſolute neceſſity for it, without a ſinful breach of Unity; and therefore though they cannot make good their claim to this Univerſal Supremacy, not ſo much as by Eccleſiaſtical Canons and Conſtitutions, and ancient Cuſtoms, as has been often proved by Learned Proteſtants; yet to ſhorten that Diſpute, which to be ſure none but Learned Men can be judges of; whatever Juriſdiction or Primacy they pretend to, have been formerly granted by Ancient Councils to the Biſhop of *Rome*, may be retrenched or denied without the Guilt of Schiſm, when it proves a manifeſt Oppreſſion of the Chriſtian Church, and ſerves only to juſtifie and perpetuate the moſt Notorious and Intolerable Corruptions of the Chriſtian Religion. And the Reaſon is very plain, becauſe all human Conſtitutions are alterable, and what is alterable ought to be altered, when the indiſpenſable Neceſſities of the Church and of Religion require it. Catholick Unity requires no Superiority, or Juriſdiction of one Biſhop or one Church over another, but only Mutual Concord and Brotherly Correſpondence; and therefore a Church which rejects any Foreign Juriſdiction, may yet maintain Catholick Unity, as the *African* Churches did in St. *Cyprians* days. The Combination indeed of Neighbour Churches and Biſhops, for the more convenient Exerciſe of Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline and Government, we grant was very Ancient,

See Dr. *Barrows* Treatiſe of SuPremacy.

cient, and is of great use to this day; but if such Combinations as these degenerate from their first Institution, and by the Tyranny and Encroachments of some usurping Bishops is improved into a Temporal Monarchy, and invasion upon the inherent Rights and Liberties of all other Bishops and Churches, I would desire to know why these Oppressed Bishops and Churches may not vindicate their own Rights and Liberties, and cast off such an intolerable Yoak?

No, you'l say, when such a Superiority and Subordination of Churches is Ordered and Decreed by general Councils, which is the Supream Authority in the Church, no change nor alteration can be made but by an equal Authority; and therefore no particular Bishops or Churches can reject any such Jurisdiction, unless it be revoked by a general Council, without the guilt of Schism.

Now in Answer to this, Let us consider, 1. Suppose such an aspiring Bishop has usurped such an Authority, as was never Orginally granted him by any Council; that he has improved a Primacy of order (which yet is more than the *Nicene* Canons granted to the Bishop of *Rome*) into a Supremacy of Jurisdiction, and has enlarged his Patriarchate beyond its original Bounds, may not that be taken away without a general Council, which was usurped indeed but never given?

2ly. Suppose a general Council had granted what it had no right to give; as it must have done, if ever any general Council had granted or confirmed the Popes Pretensions, of being the Universal Bishop and visible Head of the Church, and

and the Fountain of all Eccleſiaſtical Authority, and granted away theſe Rights and Powers, which are inherent in every Church, and inſeparable from the Epiſcopal Office. For it is not in Eccleſiaſtical as it is in Civil Rights; Men may irrevocably grant away their own Civil Rights and Liberties, but all the Authority in the Church cannot give away it ſelf, nor grant the whole intire Epiſcopacy, with all the Rights and Powers of it, to any one Biſhop. If Biſhops will not exerciſe that Power which Chriſt has given them, they are accountable to their Lord for it; but they cannot give it away, neither from themſelves, nor from their Succeſſors; for it is theirs only to uſe, not to part with; and therefore every Biſhop may reaſſume ſuch Rights, though a general Council ſhould give them away, becauſe the grant is void in it ſelf.

3ly. Eſpecially when the Regular means of Redreſs is made impoſſible by ſuch Uſurpations; when the Chriſtian Church is ſo inſlaved to the Will and Pleaſure of one Domineering Biſhop, that there can be no general Council unleſs he call it, and preſide in it, and confirm it by his own Authority; and how impoſſible it is this way to caſt off ſuch an uſurping Power, when the Uſurper muſt be the Judg in his own Cauſe; I need not prove, eſpecially when Chriſtian Princes and Biſhops are ſo devoted to the See of *Rome*, either linked to it by ſecular Intereſts, or over-awed by Superſtition; that it is in vain to expect that ſuch a Council ſhould Redreſs ſuch Abuſes, as they themſelves are fond of; or if they would have them

Redreſſed if they could, yet dare not venture to attempt it; muſt all Biſhops now and Churches quietly ſubmit to ſuch Uſurpations, becauſe the greateſt number of them will not, or dare not, vindicate their own Rights? Is it then unlawful for Chriſtian Biſhops to Exerciſe that Authority which Chriſt has given them, and of which they muſt give an Account, if they happen to be outvoted by other Biſhops; I grant the leſs number of Biſhops cannot make Laws for the Univerſal Church, in oppoſition to the greater numbers; whatever Conſtitutions owe their Authority to mutual Conſent, muſt in all reaſon be confirmed and overruled by the greater numbers; but the leſs number, nay any ſingle Biſhop may obſerve the Inſtitutions of our Saviour, and exerciſe that Authority which he has given him, without asking leave of general Councils, nay in oppoſition to them; for the Authority and Inſtitution of our Saviour is beyond all the general Councils in the World.

4. Eſpecially when we have the conſent of much the greater number of Biſhops, without their meeting in a general Council. All the Eaſtern Biſhops, which are much more numerous than the Weſtern, I cannot ſay, have caſt off the Authority of the Biſhop of *Rome*, becauſe they never owned it, but yet they oppoſe and reject his Authority, as much as the Biſhops of *England* do; and therefore our Reformers in caſting off the Pope, did nothing but what they had the Authority of the whole Eaſtern Church to juſtifie; which I take to be as good as a Council of Weſtern Biſhops, though they may call it General: For the Buſineſs of

of a Council in ſuch caſes, is not to conſent to ſome new Laws, but to declare ancient and original Rights; and if we have their authentick Declarations in this matter, we need no more: For we do not ſo much want their Authority, as their Judgment in this Point. It is a very daring thing to oppoſe the univerſal Conſent of the whole Chriſtian Church; and no private Biſhops, nor National Combination of Biſhops, would be able to bear up againſt ſuch a Prejudice; but when we have the concurrent Opinions of the greateſt number of Chriſtian Biſhops, we need not much concern our ſelves for want of the Formality of a Weſtern Council, who are intereſted Parties; yes, you'l ſay, at leaſt the Church of *England* was ſubject to the Juriſdiction of the Weſtern Patriarch, and therefore ought not to have innovated without the Patriarchal Authority, and a Patriarchal Council, nor to have rejected the Patriarchal Authority, which was confirmed by ancient Councils. Now, not to diſpute this at preſent, Whether *England* were ſubject to the Biſhop of *Rome*, as the Weſtern Patriarch, which it is certain our Brittiſh Biſhops, when *Auſtin* the Monk came into *England*, would not own; and which was never granted by any ancient General Council: and the Submiſſion of the *Engliſh* Biſhops afterwards by Fear or Flattery, could never give ſuch a Right as ſhould oblige all their Succeſſours for future Ages; yet I ſay this Patriarchal Authority is not the Diſpute between the Church of *England* and the Church of *Rome*. Our Reformers took no notice of the Patriarchal Authority, but the Univerſal Headſhip and Supremacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, as is evi-

See Dr. *Stillingfl.* Origines Britan. p. 106. &c.

dent

dent from the Articles of our Church, in which there is no mention of it: And this was ſuch an Uſurpation as might be renounced, without the Authority of any Council, as I have already ſhown. Indeed his Patriarchal Authority, if he had any, neceſſarily fell with it: For when he challenges ſuch an exorbitant Power, ſo far exceeding the Bounds and Limits of a Patriarchal Authority, and will exerciſe all, if he exerciſe any, and will hold Communion with none upon any other terms, and will not be confined to a meer Patriarchal Juriſdiction, we muſt neceſſarily renounce all Subjection to him to deliver our ſelves from his Uſurpations; when his pretended Patriarchate is ſwallowed up in his Univerſal Headſhip, he may thank himſelf, if he forfeits what he might with a better Appearance make ſome Pretence to, by challenging ſo much more than ever was his right. And the Patriarchal Authority it ſelf, could he have made any pretences to it, which he never could over the Church of *England*, which was originally a free and independent Church, being but a human Conſtitution, may be renounced without Schiſm, when neceſſity requires it; and certainly, if ever there can be any neceſſity for ſuch a Rupture, it becomes neceſſary then, when it ſwells into a boundleſs, and unlimited Authority, to the Oppreſſion of the whole Chriſtian Church in her eſſential Rights and Liberties.

5ly. There is one thing more I would have obſerved for the right ſtating of this Diſpute about Schiſm. *viz.* the difference between Schiſm from the Catholick Church, and the Breach of Eccleſiaſti-

cal

eal Communion between different Churches. In the firſt Senſe Schiſm cuts us off from the Body of Chriſt, and conſequently puts us out of a ſtate of Salvation; and therefore it can be nothing leſs than a Separation from the Communion of the Church in things eſſential to Faith, or Worſhip, or Government; for in this ſenſe no man can be a Schiſmatick, without, in ſome Degree or other, forfeiting his Chriſtianity, and his eſſential Right to Chriſtian Communion.

Eccleſiaſtical Communion is the Union of ſeveral diſtinct Churches into one Eccleſiaſtical Body for mutual Advice and Counſel, and the more pure Adminiſtration of Diſcipline. When ſeveral Biſhops who have originally all the ſame Authority in the Government of their ſeveral Churches, beſtow different Powers on ſome Biſhops, whom they advance above others with the Title and Authority of Metropolitans, or Patriarchs, with a Power of calling Synods, and receiving Appeals, and the principal Authority of Ordinations; and govern their ſeveral Churches by ſuch Eccleſiaſtical Laws, as are agreed on by common Conſent, or the major Vote, This is a very uſeful Conſtitution, and of great Antiquity in the Church, if it had not its beginning in the Apoſtles times; and for any Biſhop or Church cauſeleſsly to break ſuch a Confederacy as this, is a very great Evil, and has the Guilt and Crime of Schiſm; but yet it does not ſeem to be ſuch a Schiſm as divides the intrinſick Unity of the Catholick Church, and cuts off ſuch a Church from the Body of Chriſt. For the Unity of the Catholick Church conſiſts in one Faith, and Worſhip, and Charity, and ſuch an external Communion, when occaſion offers, ſhows, that

that we are all the Diſciples of the ſame common Lord and Saviour; and own each other for Brethren; but the Church may be the *one Body* of Chriſt, without being *one Eccleſiaſtical Body*, under one governing Head, which it is impoſſible the whole Chriſtian Church ſhould be; and therefore a Church which divides it ſelf from that Eccleſiaſtical Body, to which it did once belong; if it have juſt and neceſſary Reaſons for what it does, is wholly blameleſs, nay, commendable for it; if it have not, it ſins according to the nature and aggravation of the Crime; but ſtill may be a Member of the Catholick Church, and ſtill enjoy all the Priviledges of a true Catholick Church, *the Communion of Saints, the Forgiveneſs of Sins, and the Promiſes of everlaſting Life:* Which ſhows us how the holy Catholick Church in the Creed may be *One*, notwithſtanding all thoſe Diviſions of Chriſtendom, which are occaſioned by the Quarrels of Biſhops, and the Diſputes about Eccleſiaſtical Canons, and Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction. Thoſe who are the Beginners or Fomentors of ſuch Diviſions, ſhall anſwer it to their Lord and Judge, as they ſhall all their other perſonal Miſcarriages: but it would be very hard, if ſuch a Church, which in its Faith and Worſhip is truly Catholick, ſhould be cut off from the Body of Chriſt, and all the Members of it put out of a State of Salvation, becauſe the Biſhops and Paſtors of ſuch Churches think fit to divide themſelves from that Eccleſiaſtical Body, to which they were united by Cuſtom, or ancient Canons. Now this is the moſt they can make of our forſaking the Eccleſiaſtical Communion of the Church of *Rome*; That we have divided

vided our ſelves from the Biſhop of *Rome*, to whom by Cuſtom, or ſome pretended Canons, we owed Obedience and Subjection; which I have proved to be very innocent in us, becauſe it was neceſſary: But ſuppoſe it were a cauſeleſs and criminal Separation, yet it is only an Eccleſiaſtical Schiſm, which does not ſeparate us from the Catholick Church, though it does from that Eccleſiaſtical Body, of which the Biſhop of *Rome* makes himſelf the Head.

This, I think, is a ſufficient Juſtification of the Church of *England* in rejecting the Authority of the Church of *Rome*; and her reforming the Errors and Corruptions of Faith and Worſhip, needs no defence at all, though there were never a pure and reformed Church in the World beſides her ſelf. For I would deſire our Author to tell me, whether it be a fault to reform the Corruptions of Faith and Worſhip. Can it be a fault then to believe as Chriſt has taught, and to worſhip God as he has preſcribed? Is it poſſible that the true Catholick Faith and Worſhip ſhould ever be a Crime? if it be not, then it can be no fault to make the Doctrines and Inſtitutions of our Saviour, the Rule of our Faith and Worſhip; and that is all that we mean by reforming; not to mend Chriſtian Religion, but to return to Primitive Chriſtianity. To caſt ſuch Doctrines out of our Creed, as Chriſt never taught, and to reject all new and ſuſpected Worſhips: And if it be always a Duty to profeſs what Chriſt and his Apoſtles have taught, and to practiſe as they have commanded; then if ever we believed or practiſed otherwiſe, it is neceſſary to reform; which is not in a proper ſenſe to reform the Church, or the Chriſtian Faith and Worſhip, but to

reform our ſelves. For the Chriſtian Faith and Worſhip is always the ſame; and if there be any thing to be reformed, it muſt be our own Errors and Miſtakes.

What then is the Fault of the Church of *England*? Why cannot ſhe be *a myſtical Member of Chriſt in Catholick Unity, or a charitable part of the Catholick Church*? The Charge is drawn up againſt her, under three Heads. 1. That *ſhe voluntarily ſeparates from all other Chriſtian Societies.* 2. *Condemns their Doctrines and Rights.* 3. *Has no viſible Correſpondence with them in the Euchariſt, nor in any religious Aſſemblies, nor ſolemn Devotions.* Let us conſider theſe diſtinctly.

1. The Church of *England voluntarily ſeparates from all other Chriſtian Societies.* This I told him was falſe as to matter of Fact; for there are a great many Chriſtian Societies which we can, and do hold Communion with, as opportunity ſerves; and he can never make good this Charge, but by denying, that there are any other Chriſtian Societies beſides the Church of *Rome*; which, I ſuppoſe, is what he intends. Well! we do ſeparate, he ſays, and that voluntarily from the Church of *Rome*, that is, from all Chriſtian Societies. Now I grant we do ſeparate from the Biſhop and the Church of *Rome*, conſidered as the Principle and Center of Catholick Unity, as I obſerved before; but conſidered as a Chriſtian Church, ſo I deny, that we ſeparate from the Church of *Rome*, or any other Chriſtian Church, as far as they are Chriſtian, and we are bound to communicate with them no farther. For, I pray, conſider what Chriſtian Communion is, which certainly

tainly is nothing elſe but to communicate in the true Chriſtian Faith and Worſhip; for to communicate in Judaiſm, Paganiſm, Mahumatiſm, or any unchriſtian Doctrines or Practices, certainly is not Chriſtian Communion: And therefore every Church is more or leſs perfect in Chriſtian Communion, according to the Purity and Perfection of her Faith and Worſhip. If then the Church of *England* profeſſes the true Chriſtian Faith, and worſhips God according to the Goſpel of his Son, without any corrupt Mixtures and Innovations, as far as true Faith and Worſhip reaches, ſhe is in Communion with all the Chriſtian Churches in the World; for ſhe agrees with them in all that they believe or practiſe, which is truly Chriſtian, and Chriſtian Communion extends no farther.

Well, but when the whole Church was agreed in Faith and Worſhip, we broke this Bond of Unity by a pretended Reformation. Suppoſe this, the Queſtion ſtill is, Whether this Unity of the Church was a Chriſtian Communion? for if it were not, it is no Separation from the Chriſtian Church, to leave its Communion in thoſe things which are not Chriſtian: And therefore the whole Controverſie will ſtill turn upon this Point, whether the Reformation of the Church of *England* be a true Goſpel Reformation; for if we reformed nothing but what ought to be reformed, then we ſeparated no farther than we ought to ſeparate; and ſuch a Separation, if you will call it a Separation, I hope, is no Crime. Did *Elias* ſeparate from the Jewiſh Church, becauſe he broke their Unity in the Worſhip of *Baal*, and reduced them to the Inſtitutions of the

Moiſaick Law, which was the Standard of their Religion and Communion? Juſt ſo the Church of *England* ſeparated from the Church of *Rome*, by rejecting thoſe Articles of Faith, and Forms of Worſhip, which are not Chriſtian. Some kind of Separation indeed there muſt be between a pure and a corrupt Church, but if you would know on which ſide the Separation is criminal, you muſt conſider on which ſide the corruption is; for neceſſary Truths can never make a criminal Separation. The Church which forſakes the Truth, is always guilty of the Separation, not the Church which forſakes Errors; and therefore it is a ridiculous thing to charge thoſe with the Schiſm, who only forſake the Company, when thoſe are the Schiſmaticks, who forſake the Truth. And yet this is the only pretence for the Church of *Rome* to charge us with Schiſm, That they did not leave us, but we left them; they kept where they were, and we went out from among them, and forſook their Communion; but it was becauſe they had firſt forſaken the Apoſtolick Communion, by corrupting the Apoſtolick Faith and Worſhip. They were the Deſerters and Separatiſts, we only returned to the true Chriſtian Commnnion, and were very ſorry to leave them behind us. The ſhort of it is this, if we cannot juſtifie our Reformation, we are Schiſmaticks; if we can, we are none: And I would deſire all Proteſtants to take notice of this ſhort Anſwer, and ſtick to it; for it is as certain as any Demonſtration in *Euclid*, that no man can be a Schiſmatick, who forſakes no Society of Chriſtians any farther than they forſake the Truth.

2. The

2. The next charge is, that we *condemn their Doctrines and their Rights*; but do we condemn any thing which ought not to be condemned? if we do it is indeed a fault; but if we don't, why are we blamed for it?

3. We have *no viſible Correſpondence with them in the Euchariſt, nor in any Religious Aſſemblies, nor Solemn Devotions.* How ſo? we viſibly receive the Euchariſt our ſelves, and perform our Solemn Devotions in Publick Aſſemblies, and this is to Communicate with the whole Chriſtian Church in the ſame Sacraments and Worſhip, and the only way that diſtant Churches have to Communicate with each other in Sacraments and Worſhip; unleſs he thinks the Church of *England* muſt travel into *France*, and *Spain*, and *Italy*, into *Greece* and *Ægypt*, and all other remote Churches to Communicate with them.

No, but when their Worſhip is brought home to us, we refuſe to joyn with them; right! for according to the Laws of Catholick Communion, when they are in *England* they ought to Communicate with us, not we with them, according to St. *Auſtins* Rule, to obſerve the Rights and Uſages of the Church, whither ſoever we come, as far as they are Innocent; if we denied to receive them to our Communion, they might with better reaſon charge us with Schiſm; but we are not bound to forſake the Communion of our own Church to follow Foreign Cuſtoms at home.

But when we do come where their Worſhip is the Eſtabliſhed Religion, we ſtill refuſe to Communicate with them; we do ſo indeed with the

Roman

Roman Church, but not with all other Chriſtian Societies; and the Reaſon is, becauſe we believe their Worſhip is ſinful, and no Chriſtian is bound to Communicate in a ſinful Worſhip, as they themſelves muſt grant: So that ſtill this whole Controverſy iſſues in this, whether the Terms of their Communion be not ſinful; if they be, this will juſtifie our Non-communion with them; if they be not, we are Schiſmaticks, and by this we are willing to ſtand or fall.

So that this charge of Schiſm upon the Church of *England* is very abſurd and ridiculous, unleſs they can charge us with Schiſmatical Doctrines and Practices; if we ſeparate for the ſake of a Corrupt Faith or Worſhip, we are Schiſmaticks indeed; but if we ſeparate, only becauſe we will not profeſs any Erroneous Doctrines, nor Communicate in a corrupt Worſhip, unleſs the true Faith and true Worſhip can make Men Schiſmaticks, we may very ſecurely ſcorn ſuch an Accuſation.

And it is as impertinent a Queſtion to ask us what Church we joyned in Communion with when we forſook the Communion of the Church of *Rome*: For if by joyning in Communion with other Churches, they mean uniting our ſelves in one Eccleſiaſtical Body with them, putting our ſelves under the Government of any other Patriarch, ſo we joyned in Communion with no other Church, and there was no reaſon we ſhould; for we were Originally a free independent Church, which owed no Subjection to any other Church, but had a plenary Power to decide all Controverſies

Controverſies among our ſelves, without appealing to any foreign Juriſdiction; and when we had delivered our ſelves from one Uſurper, there was no reaſon to court a new one, this not being neceſſary to Catholick Unity and Communion.

If by joyning in Communion with other Churches, they mean, what other Churches we made the Pattern of our Reformation, we freely confeſs we made no Church of that Age our Pattern; but I think we did much better, for we made the Scriptures our Rule, and the Primitive and Apoſtolick Churches our Pattern, which we take to be a more Infallible direction than the Example of any Church then or now: If we muſt have been confined to the Faith and Practiſe of other Churches then in being, without regard to a more Infallible Rule, and a more unqueſtionable Authority, I confeſs, I ſhould have choſe to have continued in the Church of *Rome*, which had the moſt viſible and flouriſhing Authority of any other Church at that time; but our Reformers did believe, and very rightly, that no Church had any Authority againſt the Scriptures and Primitive Practiſe, and then they were not concerned to enquire whether any other Church did in all things believe and practiſe as they taught, but what the Faith and Practice of the Apoſtles and their immediate Succeſſors was; and yet they very well know, that moſt of thoſe Doctrines and Practiſes, which they condemned in the Church of *Rome*, were condemned by other Churches alſo, though it may be thoſe other Churches might have ſome leſs Errors and Corruptions of their own.

own. If the Scriptures and the Example of the Primitive Churches be a ſufficient Authority to juſtifie a Reformation, then the Church of *England* is blameleſs, though no other Church in the World followed this Pattern but our ſelves; for this is the Rule and Pattern which they ought all to follow, and if they do not, it is not we are to blame, but themſelves.

And yet what if I ſhould ſay, that our Reformers made the Church of *Rome* her ſelf, the Pattern of our Reformation; and indeed this is the plain truth of the Caſe. For we framed no new Creeds, no new Articles of Faith, no new Forms of Worſhip, no new Models of Government, but retained all that is Ancient and Apoſtolick in the Church of *Rome*, and only rejected thoſe Corruptions and Innovations, which were introduced in ſeveral Ages, and confirmed all together by the Council of *Trent*. Our Faith is contained in the Apoſtles, *Nicene*, *Athanaſian* Creeds, which are all owned by the Church of *Rome*, and were the Ancient Faith of the Catholick Church. We own the two Chriſtian Sacraments, Baptiſm and the Lords Supper, which were expreſly Inſtituted by our Saviour himſelf, and which the Church of *Rome* owns. We Worſhip one God through Jeſus Chriſt, who is that one Mediator between God and Man, as the Church of *Rome* confeſſes, though ſhe brings in a great many other Mediators by the help of a diſtinction. Our publick Liturgie is ſo conformed to the Ancient Liturgies of the *Roman* Church, that it has been often objected to us, though very peeviſhly and abſurdly, by

by Diſſenters, that our Common Prayer is taken out of the Maſs Book: Our Litanies, Collects, Hymns, are many of them taken out of the old Latin Liturgies, only we have changed the Popiſh Legends into Leſſons out of the Old and New Teſtaments, and have left out Prayers to Saints, and all the Corruptions of the Maſs, and other Superſtitions: So that in Truth the Church of *England* is the exact Reſemblance of the Church of *Rome* in her ſtate of Primitive Purity, before her Faith and Worſhip were corrupted with new and ſuperſtitious Additions; and it is plain that this was the Rule of our Reformation, not to form and model a new Church, but only to Purge the Church from all new Corruptions, and to leave the old Foundations and Building as it was; and if we have indeed retained all that is Ancient and Apoſtolick in the Church of *Rome*, and rejected nothing but Innovations in Faith, and Corruptions in Worſhip; they need not enquire for a Church which believes all that we do, for the Church of *Rome* her ſelf does ſo, and if they believe more than they ſhould, it is no fault that we do not believe all that they do; and therefore we had no need to ſeek for any other Church to joyn with; for we ſtaid where we were, and did not leave our Church, but Reform it; and a Man who does not pull down his Houſe, but only cleanſes it, and makes it a more wholſom Habitation, needs not inquire for a new Houſe to dwell in.

To conclude this Argument, our poſitive Faith and Worſhip is the ſame ſtill with the Church of *Romes*, and therefore they cannot blame us for it; and in thoſe Doctrines and Practices wherein we have forſaken the Church of *Rome*, we have the Authority and Practice of moſt other Churches to juſtifie us, which do not own the Supremacy of the Pope, nor Tranſubſtantiation, nor Purgatory, nor Communion in one kind, nor Latin Service, nor the Worſhip of Images, with ſeveral other of the *Trent* Innovations: So that in truth we are ſo far from ſeparating from all Chriſtian Societies, that there are few things in our Reformation, but what are owned and juſtified either by the Church of *Rome* her ſelf, or by ſome other Churches; not to take notice now, that there are few things in our Reformation but what ſome Doctors of the *Roman* Communion, have either juſtified, or ſpoke modeſtly of.

16. *The whole Clergy of the Catholick Church may Apoſtatize from Fundamental Truth and Holineſs, whilſt part of a National Laity may preſerve both, diſcover the Clergies defection, and depriving them heap to themſelves Teachers of their own ſending and inſtruction.*

Anſwer to Requeſt.

In Anſwer to this I told him, that if by this he meant, *that the whole Clergy of the Chriſtian World did at the time of the Reformation maintain the Doctrines of the Church of* Rome, *which were rejected and condemned only by a Major Vote of a Parliament of Lay-men in* England, *all the World knew how falſe it is.* For, 1. *There were many other Churches, and*

and better parts of the Catholick Church than the Church of Rome, *which did not own thoſe Doctrines and Corruptions, which we reject.* 2. *Nay the whole Clergy of the* Roman *Church did not, for many of our* Engliſh *Biſhops and Clergy were as Zealous for the Reformation as any Lay-men; ſo were the* German *Reformers,* who were Originally Popiſh Monks and Prieſts, and yet did not follow the Laity, but lead them way to the Reformation.

Proteſtancy deſtitute of Scripture Proofs.

In reply to this, he ſays, *I manifeſt my ſelf meanly verſed in the Story of my own Party, or no friend to Ingennity and Truth.* For *it is certainly true and atteſted by Proteſtant Hiſtorians and Records, that all the Biſhops, and the whole Convocation declared againſt Lay-ſupremacy and other Proteſtant Points, and for Non-compliance therewith were almoſt all deprived; the Queen and her Lay-Parliament enacting Supremacy, whereby ſhe impoſed new Doctrines, diſplaced the Catholick Clergy, and created Prelatick Miniſters.* And whether he or I be moſt in the right let the Reader Judg. For, 1. It is plain I did not ſpeak only of the Clergy of *England*, but of *the whole Clergy of the Catholick Church*, as he himſelf ſtated the Queſtion; and he anſwers only to the Clergy of *England*, and with what Truth ſhall be examined preſently: For if the whole Clergy of the Catholick Church have not Apoſtatized, whatever the Clergy of the Church of *Rome* has done, he loſes the very Foundation of his Requeſt to us, to prove *that the whole Clergy of the Catholick Church have Apoſtatized from Fundamental Truth and Holineſs*, for we are not

bound to prove that which is falſe; but he who allows no Catholick Church but the Church of *Rome*, muſt conſequently allow no Clergy of the Catholick Church, but the *Roman* Clergy, but we grant neither one nor t'other; and yet as I ſhowed the *Roman* Clergy themſelves were the firſt Reformers; and therefore what he inſinuates cannot be true, that the whole *Roman* Clergy oppoſed the *Roman* Laity in the Reformation.

2. As for the *Engliſh* Reformation, he confines it in his Anſwer only to the Story of Queen *Elizabeth*, and what was done in her Reign; but the Article he would have proved, and the Anſwer I gave to it has no ſuch limitation; and I muſt ſtill repeat, that all the World knows, and, the Hiſtories and Records of our Church aſſure us, that the Popiſh Biſhops and Convocation in *Henry* the Eight's days did acknowledg the Kings Supremacy, and in higher Terms than Queen *Elizabeth* would challenge it. Indeed the late *Oxford* Writer, or rather Publiſher of Books, charges this upon that force they were under; that is, that the Clergy was taken in a Præmunire, and the King would not compound the Buſineſs with them, unleſs they acknowledged him to be the Head of the Church. But does this prove that they did not make this Recognition? if force or flattery can corrupt the whole Clergy; then it ſeems the whole Clergy of the (*Roman*) Catholick Church may Apoſtatize from Fundamental Truth and Holineſs, if they fall firſt into a Præmunire, and meet with

Church Government. Part. 5. *Engliſh* Reformation ch. 2. p. 21.

with a King who will take the Advantage of it; and are not the Clergy then admirable Guides to follow? eſpecially if they can be ſo over-awed, as not only to make ſuch a Profeſſion, but to Write and Diſpute for it, and uſe all variety of Arguments to perſwade People to believe it.

The Inſtitution for the neceſſary Erudition of a Chriſtian man, was agreed on in Convocation, and publiſhed by Authority. Biſhop *Gardiner* wrote a Book *de vera Obedientia*, to which *Bonner* prefixed a Preface upon the ſame Argument. *Stokeſly*, Biſhop of *London*, and *Tonſtal* Biſhop of *Dureſm*, wrote in defence of the Kings Proceedings, to Cardinal *Pool*; and many Sermons were preached by ſeveral Biſhops to the ſame purpoſe; out of which Dr. *Burnet* has collected the Arguments uſed by them, both againſt the Power of the Pope, and for the Supremacy of the King: And during that Seſſion of Parliament, which took away the Power of the Pope in the year 1534. A Biſhop preached every Sunday at St. *Paul*'s Croſs, and taught the People, that the Pope had no Authority in *England*. Was all this matter of force too, and fear of the *Præmunire*, which was pardoned in Parliament, *Anno* 1531. three years before? *Burnets* Hiſtory of the Reformation, part 1. book 2. p. 137.

Let us now conſider what paſſed under Queen *Elizabeth*: And methinks, what was good Doctrine in King *Henry*'s time, ſhould be good Doctrine ſtill: and yet it is true, that many Biſhops then did proteſt againſt the Act for Supremacy, and refuſed the Oath when it was offered them; and that many of thoſe Biſhops who had wrote, or preached for it before

fore, ſuch as *Bonner*, Biſhop of *London*, and *Tonſtal* of *Dureſm*, which ſeems to leſſen their Authority in this matter; and when the Nation had ſo lately had the ſenſe of the whole *Engliſh Roman* Clergy in this Point, their preſent obſtinacy to confirm their former Opinions, without anſwering their former Reaſons, was no ſufficient cauſe why a Lay-Parliament ſhould not renew ſuch Laws without the conſent of the Clergy, which were at firſt made with it: not a Biſhop diſſenting, excepting *Fiſher* Biſhop of *Rocheſter*: And whereas he talks in ſuch a ſtrain, as if this were oppoſed by the whole Clergy, and that they were almoſt all deprived for it, the account which the Viſiters gave the Queen, is very different, that of 9400 beneficed Men in *England*, there were no more but fourteen Biſhops, ſix Abbots, twelve Deans, twelve Archdeacons, fifteen Heads of Colledges, fifty Prebendaries, and eighty Rectors of Pariſhes, that had left their Benefices upon account of Religion, which is a very inconſiderable number to the whole.

Burnets Hiſtory of the Reform. part 2. l. 3. p. 401.

3. I anſwered farther, *That we do not ſay, that the* Roman *Church her ſelf has apoſtatized from fundamental Truth and Holineſs. We do grant, that they have retained the true Faith and Worſhip of Chriſt, though they have fatally corrupted both by Additions of their own.* And therefore we are not bound to prove, that *the whole Clergy of the Catholick Church may apoſtatize from fundamental Truth and Holineſs*; for we do not ſay they did.

All that he replies to this, is, That *this Apoſtacy (at the leaſt) is taught in the* 19 *and* 21 *Articles and Homilies*

Homilies againſt the Peril of Idolatry. That is to ſay (for I ſuppoſe that is his meaning) that the Church of *England* charges the Church of *Rome* with Idolatry, and Idolatry is an Apoſtacy from fundamental Truth and Holineſs. But if men may be guilty of ſome kinds of Idolatry, and of very great corruptions in Faith and Worſhip, without denying any fundamental Article of the Chriſtian Faith, then Idolatry it ſelf does not prove ſuch an Apoſtacy from fundamental Truth. And this is the opinion of thoſe who own the Church of *Rome* a true, though a corrupt Church, notwithſtanding they charge her with idolatrous Practices. For they conſider, that the Jewiſh Church was guilty of Idolatry in the Worſhip of the Golden Calf, and the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel*, and yet were a true Church ſtill, becauſe they worſhipped only the true God, the God of *Iſrael*, though in an idolatrous manner. And I would adviſe our Author not to inſiſt too peremptorily on this, That Idolatry is an Apoſtacy from fundamental Truth, till he is ſure that he can clear himſelf and his Church from the charge of Idolatry. I know very well what he aims at, to diſprove the charge of Idolatry, becauſe Idolatry is an Apoſtacy from fundamental Truth and Holineſs; and thus the Church cannot apoſtatize, and therefore cannot commit Idolatry; which is like their proving, that the Church has not erred, becauſe it cannot err: Whereas if *de facto* it appears that the Church has erred, that is a Demonſtration that it can err. Thus if *de facto* it appears that the Church is guilty of

of Idolatry, this is a Demonſtration, that either Idolatry is not ſuch a fundamental Apoſtacy, or that the Church may fall into ſuch an Apoſtacy. Thoſe who ſay, that Idolatry is not ſuch an Apoſtacy, are not bound to prove that the Church may fall into ſuch an Apoſtacy from fundamental Truth, to make good their charge of Idolatry. Thoſe who ſay, that Idolatry is ſuch an Apoſtacy, are bound to prove, either directly, that the Church is not guilty of Idolatry, or by conſequence that ſhe cannot be, becauſe ſhe cannot apoſtatize from fundamental Truth: ſo that the Proof lies on their ſide, not on ours; we are not bound to prove that the Church may apoſtatize from fundamental Truth and Holineſs, becauſe we have no occaſion to ſay it may; but they are bound to prove that the Church cannot ſo apoſtatize, becauſe it is the beſt defence they have againſt the charge of Idolatry.

But I cannot paſs on without briefly conſidering the nature of this Argument, to prove that a thing is not, upon a pretence that it cannot be, when there is all other poſſible evidence to prove that it is; which is now the modiſh and popular way of diſputing, and the very laſt refuge of the Church of *Rome*. If you charge them with Errors and Corruptions in Faith and Worſhip, and prove your charge beyond the poſſibility of a fair Reply, they preſently take ſanctuary in the Indefectibility or Infallibility of their Church. Their Church cannot err, becauſe the Council, or Pope, or at leaſt both of them together, are infallible: Or, as others

ſay,

ſay, Tradition is infallible; for the Church muſt believe to day, as it did yeſterday, and to morrow as it does to day, and ſo from one Generation to another; and therefore it is impoſſible there ever ſhould be any change in the Faith of the Church. The Church cannot be guilty of Idolatry, becauſe it cannot apoſtatize from fundamental Truth and Holineſs; and ſo in other caſes: And therefore the way they take with their new Converts, is not to diſpute particular Controverſies, but inſtruct them well in this one Point, which puts an end to all other Diſputes, That the Church cannot err, and cannot apoſtatize from fundamental Truth and Holineſs; and then it is certain, whatever ſhe teaches, ſhe cannot err; and whatever ſhe does, is not Apoſtacy. Now not to ſhow at preſent how vainly the Church of *Rome* challenges to her ſelfe the Title, Priviledges, and Prerogatives of the Catholick Church, and appropriates all thoſe Promiſes to her ſelf, which were made to the Church in general; nor to examine the meaning of thoſe Texts, whereon ſhe founds this pretence of Infallibility, I ſhall only conſider, whether this Plea, the Church cannot err, therefore ſhe has not erred; the Church cannot apoſtatize from fundamental Truth and Holineſs, therefore ſhe is not guilty of Idolatry; which, ſay they, is ſuch an Apoſtacy, be ſufficient to ſatisfie any honeſt inquiſitive man, who can read the Scriptures, and compare what the Church now believes and practiſes, with the Doctrines and Inſtitutions of our Saviour. For,

1. When ſuch Errors and Corruptions are notoriouſly evident, though but in any one inſtance, to argue that the Church has not erred, becauſe ſhe cannot err, is to diſpute againſt matter of fact, like the Philoſophers diſputing againſt the poſſibility of Motion; and no Argument whatſoever is good againſt matter of fact. True, you'l ſay, if it were notoriouſly evident that the Church has erred, there were an end of her Infallibility; but this is matter of diſpute, whether ſhe have erred or not, and then if you can prove that ſhe cannot err, you effectually prove that ſhe has not erred. No ſuch matter; for if ſhe be charged with Errors, and plain evidence brought, that ſhe has actually erred, unleſs you can as plainly take off this evidence, it weakens and overthrows all the Proofs for Infallibility whatever they are; and therefore the pretence of Infallibility is of no uſe in this diſpute, but to cheat the ignorant and unwary; for if I can prove that ſuch Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome* are Errors and Corruptions, till I am ſatisfied that they are not, I can never believe that Church to be infallible, which I can prove has erred: and therefore while any charge againſt the Errors of the Church of *Rome* remains unanſwered, it is too ſoon to talk of her Infallibility; for actual Error is a juſt confutation of Infallibility, but the pretence of Infallibility is not a juſt Plea againſt the charge of actual Error; becauſe if I can prove my charge againſt them, that they have erred, that diſproves their Infallibility, and then nothing elſe can prove it: So that this Infallibility can

can do them no ſervice at all in this Diſpute, whether they have erred or not; for if I can prove that they have erred, I overthrow all their Proofs of Infallibility; and whether they have erred or not, is not to be tryed by their Infallibility, but by the Rule of Truth and Error, which are the Holy Scriptures; ſo abſurd it is to think to determine all the Controverſies now in diſpute among us, by the Churches Infallibility.

It is indeed a moſt certain Truth, that if the Church be infallible, ſhe cannot err, and therefore ſhe has not erred; and it is as certainly true, that if the Church has erred, ſhe can err, and therefore is not infallible. The *Romaniſts* aſſert the firſt, the *Proteſtants* the ſecond; but there is this difference between theſe two Pleas, That if we can make good our charge againſt them, that they have actually erred, this is a direct and poſitive Proof againſt their Infallibility; but though it be as certainly true, that an infallible Church cannot, and has not erred, yet whatever Proofs they bring of the Churches Infallibility, they are not a direct Anſwer to that charge, That ſhe has actually erred, and can have no force to prove her Infallibility, till that charged be anſwered, becauſe there can be no Proof againſt matter of fact. And therefore when they begin with the Proof of Infallibility, they begin at the wrong end; for when the Church is charged with Error, if they would not loſe their labour, they muſt prove that ſhe has not erred, before they prove her to be infallible; for otherwiſe after all the pains they have taken to prove

her Infallibility, if they cannot deliver her from the charge of having erred, their Labour is loſt, and therefore it is beſt to try that firſt; which ſhows what a Sophiſtical Argument it is to prove that the Church has not erred, becauſe ſhe is infallible and cannot err; for they muſt firſt prove that ſhe has not erred, before they can prove her to be infallible; for till this be removed, it is an effectual Bar to all other Proofs of Infallibility. And thus their compendious way of making Converts, and confuting Hereticks, is nothing but Sophiſtry and a Cheat; and if men would be ſincere and honeſt Converts, they muſt not flatter themſelves with an Opinion of the Churches Infallibility, but muſt examine the particular Diſputes between us, and be thoroughly ſatisfied that the Church of *Rome* has not erred, before they embrace her Communion.

2. For if it appear, that the Church of *Rome* has been guilty of Error or Apoſtacy, this is a certain Demonſtration, that either thoſe Scripture-promiſes which ſhe alledges, do not belong to her, or do not ſignifie what ſhe brings them for; for whatever Chriſt promiſes, he will certainly perform; and therefore if the Church of *Rome* has erred, he never promiſed ſhe ſhould be infallible. To be ſure when the Senſe and Application of ſuch Texts of Scripture are diſputed, as they are between Proteſtants and Papiſts, that ſide muſt have the advantage, which is confirmed by the Event, and matter of Fact; and therefore if it appear the Church of *Rome* has erred, the Proteſtant Inter-

pre-

pretations of thoſe Texts, *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock will I build my Church, and ſuch like*, are to be preferred before the Popiſh Interpretations, which apply them to the Biſhops of *Rome*, as the Infallible Guides of the Church, eſpecially when that evidence we have that the Church has Erred, is much more plain and notorious, then that Chriſt has promiſed that ſhe ſhall not Err; when the Scripture Proofs, that the Church of *Rome* has Erred in ſeveral Doctrines and Practices which ſhe now teaches, are much plainer than thoſe Texts are, by which they prove that ſhe cannot Err: if I can prove by plain Texts that ſhe has Erred, this ſhall teach me how to expound thoſe obſcure Texts, from which ſome would prove that ſhe cannot Err. Indeed it is very happy that no Man believes Chriſt has promiſed Infallibility to the Church of *Rome*, but thoſe who believe that ſhe has not Erred; for if they did, it would be a very dangerous State of Temptation, and a very ill Argument in the hands of an Infidel againſt Chriſtianity; for they would rather charge Chriſt with a breach of his Promiſe, which would deſtroy his Authority, than believe contrary to the plaineſt and moſt convincing Evidence, that the Church of *Rome* has not erred; and indeed it would ſtagger the Faith of a Chriſtian, if the pretended Promiſes of Infalibility to the Church of *Rome*, were as plain as her Errors are; for what ſhould any Man do in that caſe? believe that ſhe has not erred, becauſe of the Promiſe of Infalibility, or diſbelieve the Promiſe becauſe ſhe has erred? When both

both ſides are equally plain, and yet can never be reconciled, it is a ſore Temptation to believe neither, when I know not which to chooſe, and cannot poſſibly believe both. So that to urge the Infallibility of the Church that ſhe cannot err againſt the plaineſt evidence that ſhe has erred, may make ſome Men Infidels, but can make no conſiderating Man a *Roman-Catholick*.

But to return to our Author, though I think I have not left him all this time, I gave a fourth Anſwer to this Requeſt, which he takes no notice of, *viz. If the firſt diſcovery of this Defection had been made by Lay-men, and afterwards acknowledged by the Clergy, who joyned in the Reformation, I ſhould not have thought the Reformation ever the worſe for it. For if the Clergy corrupt Religion, we have reaſon to thank God if he opens the Eyes of honeſt and diſintereſted Lay-men.* For this is the great grievance, that the Clergy ſhould Apoſtatize, and a National Laity diſcover the Clergies Defection and reform it. This is now the faſhionable way of Diſputing againſt the Reformation of the Church of *England*, that it was not regularly done by the conſent of the Major part of the Clergy in a National Synod, which firſt ought to have been obtained, before the Queen and the Parliament had made any Laws about it; which is the whole deſign of a late *Oxford* Book againſt the Reformation. Now this I confeſs ſeems to me a very ſtrange way of Reaſoning, unworthy of Chriſtians, eſpecially of Chriſtian Divines; for not to enter now into the Hiſtory of the Reformation,

Church Government Part. 5. concerning the *Engliſh* Reformation.

mation, which those who please may learn from Dr, *Burnet*, who has Published the Authentick Records of the most material Transactions in it, yet I say,

1. If the Reformation be good and necessary, there can want no Authority to reform; and my Reason is, because it is Established by the Authority of Christ and his Apostles, which is a good Authority to this day; for to Reform Abuses and Corruptions, signifies no more than to Profess the pure and uncorrupted Faith and Worship of Christ; and I desire to know whether Christ have not given sufficient Authority to every Man to do this? or whether there be any Authority in Church or State which can *de jure* forbid the doing it, and make it unlawful and irregular to do so? if there be, truly Christ and his Apostles have preached the Gospel to very little purpose, if we must not believe or practice as they teach, unless our Superiors will give us leave. How could the Gospel have been at first planted in the World upon these Principles? Jews and Heathens had a regular Authority among them to determine matters of Religion, and this Authority opposed and condemned the Faith of Christ; and therefore unless particular Men had reformed for themselves, and joyned themselves to the Fellowship of the Apostles, they must have continued Jews or Pagans to this day. For as for what our Author says, that *such a change in Religion ought to have some Scripture, or because Extraordinary, should have Miracles to countenance it*: I answer,

ſwer, we have both, we have reformed according to the Scriptures, and can juſtifie our Faith and Worſhip by the Scriptures, and a Scripture Reformation is confirmed by Miracles, becauſe the Doctrine of the Goſpel is ſo confirmed; and we no more want new Miracles to confirm our Reformation, than to confirm the Authority of the Chriſtian Religion; for Reformed Chriſtianity is nothing elſe but the old Primitive Apoſtolick Chriſtianity; and therefore we have the ſame Authority to reform now, which the Apoſtles at firſt had to preach the Goſpel; for their Authority to preach the Goſpel is, and will be to the end of the World, a ſufficient Authority to all Men to believe it, and conſequently to renounce all Errors and Corruptions in Faith and Worſhip, which are contrary to it.

2. As for the Authority of the Clergy, whatever it be, it is certain Chriſt gave them no Authority to preach any other Goſpel than what he had taught them, which is the expreſs Commiſſion which he gave to the Apoſtles themſelves; and therefore whatever Decrees, and Definitions they have made contrary to the true Faith and Worſhip of Chriſt, are void of themſelves, and want no Authority to repeal them.

As for that diſtinction between making and declaring new Articles of Faith, it is a meer piece of Sophiſtry; for if they have the power of declaring, and no body muſt oppoſe them, nor judg of their Declarations under the pretence of declaring,

declaring, they may make as many new Articles of Faith as they pleaſe; as we ſee the Council of *Trent* has done: This Extravagant Authority they give to the Clergy, of making Decrees and Canons concerning Faith and Worſhip, which ſhall oblige the Laity to a blind Obedience and implicit Faith, is a moſt ridiculous pretence, unleſs it be ſupported with Infallibility; and yet you have already heard, that the pretence of Infallibility it ſelf, though it may ſilence thoſe Mens objections, and ſtop their farther inquiries who do really believe it, yet it is no defence againſt the charge of Errors, nor a ſufficient Anſwer to that charge; and how vain the pretence it ſelf is, has been abundantly proved in ſome late Treatiſes.

See the Authority of Councils, with the Appendix, in Anſwer to the eight Theſes of the *Oxford* Writer, And the Judge of Controverſies.

This is enough to ſhow how inſignificant that charge is againſt the Reformation, that thoſe Biſhops and Prieſts who were at that time in Power, and were zealouſly addicted to the Intereſts of *Rome*, would not concur in it, though afterwards much the greater numbers ſubmitted to it, and thereby gave it an after confirmation, which is as much as they can pretend for the confirmation of ſome of their General Councils. I grant, nothing can be looked on as the Act of the Clergy, which is not done by a regular Authority, according to the Rules of that Church, nor do we pretend that the Reformation was perfected or finiſhed by the regular Authority of the Popiſh Clergy, though ſeveral of them were Zealous in it; but we ſay it is never the worſe for

that; if they can prove that what we call a Reformation is faulty upon other Accounts, then we will grant that to reform againſt the conſent of the Clergy did greatly aggravate the Crime; but if the Reformation were juſt and neceſſary, and a true Reformation of the Errors and Corruptions of Chriſtianity, the diſſent of the Clergy could not and ought not to hinder it, for they had no ſuch Authority from Chriſt, either to corrupt Religion, or to hinder the Reformation of it.

3. The Supreme Authority of any Nation has a regular Authority to declare what ſhall be the Eſtabliſhed Religion of that Nation; and therefore the Queen and the Parliament could make the Reformed Religion the National Religion Eſtabliſhed by Law; and this is all that we Attribute to Kings and Parliaments. We do not juſtifie our Reformation becauſe it was confirmed by the Authority of Parliament, but becauſe it is agreeable to Scripture; But we Thank God that he then inclined the heart of the Queen and Parliament to Eſtabliſh the Reformation, and heartily pray that he would ſtill continue it to us and to our Poſterity for ever. *Amen.*

The End.

Books lately printed for Richard Chiſwell.

THE Hiſtory of the Reformation of the *Church of England*. By *GILBERT BURNET*, D. D. in two Volumes. *Folio.*

The Moderation of the *Church of England*, in her Reformation, in avoiding all undue Compliances with *Popery*, and other ſorts of *Phanaticiſm*, &c. by *TIMOTHY FULLER*, D. D. *Octavo.*

A Diſſertation concerning the Government of the *Ancient Church*: more particularly of the Encroachments of the *Biſhops of Rome* upon other *Sees*. By *WILLIAM CAVE*, D. D. *Octavo.*

An Anſwer to Mr. *Serjeant's* [Sure Footing in Chriſtianity] concerning the Rule of Faith: With ſome other Diſcourſes. By *WILLIAM FALKNER*, D. D. 4°.

A Vindication of the Ordinations of the *Church of England*; in Anſwer to a Paper written by one of the *Church of Rome*, to prove the Nullity of our Orders. By *GILBERT BURNET*, D. D. *Octavo.*

An Abridgment of the Hiſtory of the Reformation of the *Church of England*. By *GILB. BURNET*, D. D. *Octavo.*

A Collection of ſeveral Tracts and Diſcourſes, written in the years 1678, 1679. *&c.* by *Gilbert Burnet*. D. D. To which are added, (1) A Letter written to Dr. *Burnet*, giving an Account of *Cardinal Pool's* ſecret Powers. (2) The Hiſtory of the *Powder-Treaſon*, with a Vindication of the Proceedings thereupon. (3.) An Impartial Conſideration of the Five Jeſuits dying Speeches, who were Executed for the Plot, 1679. In *Quarto.*

The APOLOGY of the *Church of England*; and an Epiſtle to one *Signior Scipio*, a *Venetian* Gentleman, concerning the Council of *Trent*. Written both in *Latin*, by the Right Reverend Father in God, *JOHN JEWEL*, Lord Biſhop of *Salisbury*: Made *Engliſh* by a Perſon of Quality. To which is added, The Life of the ſaid Biſhop: Collected and written by the ſame Hand. *Octavo.*

A LETTER writ by the laſt Aſſembly General of the *Clergy of France* to the *Proteſtants*, inviting them to return to *their* Communion. Together with the *Methods* propoſed by them for their Conviction. Tranſlated into Engliſh, and *Examined*, by *GILB. BURNET*, D. D. *Octavo.*

The Life of *WILLIAM BEDEL*, D. D. Biſhop of *Kilmore* in *Ireland*. Together with *Certain Letters* which paſſed betwixt him and *James Waddeſworth* (a late Penſioner of the Holy Inquiſition of *Sevil*) in Matter of Religion, concerning the General Motives to the *Roman Obedience*. *Octavo.*

The

Books lately printed for Richard Chiſwell.

The Decree made at *ROME* the Second of *March*, 1679. condemning ſome Opinions of the *Jeſuits*, and other *Caſuiſts*. *Quarto.*

A Diſcourſe concerning the Neceſſity of Reformation, with reſpect to the Errors and Corruptions of the *Church of Rome*. *Quarto.* Firſt and Second Parts.

A Diſcourſe concerning the Celebration of Divine Service in an Unknown Tongue. *Quarto.*

A Papiſt not Miſrepreſented by Proteſtants. Being a Reply to the Reflections upon the Anſwer to [A Papiſt Miſrepreſented and Repreſented]. *Quarto.*

An Expoſition of the Doctrine of the *Church of England*, in the ſeveral Articles propoſed by the late BISHOP of *CONDOM*, [in his Expoſition of the *Doctrine* of the *Catholick Church.*] *Quarto.*

A *Defence* of the *Expoſition* of the *Doctrine* of the *CHURCH of ENGLAND*, againſt the *EXCEPTIONS* of *Monſieur de MEAUX*, late Biſhop of *Condom*, and his *VINDICATOR*. *Quarto.*

An Anſwer to *THREE PAPERS* lately printed, concerning the Authority of the *Catholick Church* in Matters of Faith, and the Reformation of the *Church of England*. *Quarto.*

A Vindication of the Anſwer to SOME LATE PAPERS concerning the Unity and Authority of the *Catholick Church*, and Reformation of the *Church of England*. Quarto.

An Hiſtorical Treatiſe, written by an AUTHOR of the *Communion* of the *CHURCH of ROME*, touching *TRANSUBSTANTIATION*. Wherein is made appear, That according to the Principles of *THAT CHURCH*, This Doctrine cannot be an Article of Faith. *Quarto.*

A *CATECHISM* explaining the Doctrine and Practices of the *Church of Rome*; with an Anſwer thereunto. By a *Proteſtant* of the *Church of England*. *Octavo.*

A *Papiſt Repreſented and not Miſrepreſented*: Being an Anſwer to the Firſt, Second, Fifth and Sixth Sheets of the *Second Part of the* [*Popiſh Repreſenter*]; and for a further Vindication of the [*CATECHISM*, truly repreſenting the Doctrine and Practices of the *Church of Rome.*] *Quarto.* In 3. Diſcourſes.

The *Lay-Chriſtian*'s Obligations to read the Holy Scriptures. *Quarto.*

The *Plain Man*'s Reply to the *Catholick Miſſionaries*. 24°.

The Proteſtant's Companion: Or an Impartial Survey, and Compariſon of the *Proteſtant Religion* as by Law eſtabliſhed, with the main *Doctrines of Popery*. Wherein is ſhewn, that Popery is contrary to Scripture, Primitive Fathers

thers and Councils; and that proved from Holy Writ, the Writings of the Ancient Fathers, for ſeveral hundred Years, and the Confeſſion of the moſt Learned Papiſts themſelves. *Quarto.*

Mr. *Chillingworth*'s Book called [*The Religion of Proteſtants a ſafe way to Salvation*] made more generally uſeful, by omitting Perſonal Conteſts, but inſerting whatſoever concerns the Common *Cauſe of Proteſtants*, or defends the Church of *England*. With an Addition of an Uſeful Table, and alſo of ſome genuine Pieces of the ſame Author never before Printed, *viz.* about Traditions, againſt the Catholiciſm and Infallibility of the Roman Church. And an Account of the Arguments which moved him to turn Papiſt, with his Confutation of the ſaid Arguments. *Quarto.*

A Diſcourſe of the *Holy Euchariſt*, in the two great points of the *Real Preſence* and the *Adoration of the Hoſt*. In Anſwer to the Two Diſcourſes lately printed at *Oxford* on this Subject. To which is prefixed a large Hiſtorical Preface relating to the ſame Argument. *Quarto.*

The Pillar and Ground of Truth. A Treatiſe ſhewing that the *Roman Church* falſly claims to be *That Church*, and the Pillar of *That Truth*, mentioned by S. *Paul* in his Firſt Epiſtle to *Timothy*, *Chap.* III. *Verſ.* 15. *Quarto.*

A Brief Diſcourſe concerning the Notes of the Church, with ſome reflections on Cardinal *Bellarmin*'s Fifteen Notes. *Quarto.*

An Examination of the Cardinal's Firſt Note, concerning [*The Name of Catholick*].

——His Second Note, [*Antiquity*].

——His Third Note, [*Duration*].

——His Fourth Note, [*Amplitude or Multitude, and variety of Believers*].

——His Fifth Note, [*The Succeſſion of Biſhops*].

——His Sixth Note, [*Agreement in Doctrine with the Primitive Church*].

——His Seventh Note, [*Union of the Members among themſelves, and with the Head*].

——His Eighth Note, [*Sanctity of Doctrine*].

(*The reſt will be publiſhed Weekly in their Order*).

A Defence of the Confuter of *Bellarmin*'s Second Note of the Church [*Antiquity*] againſt the Cavills of the Adviſer. *Quarto.*

The

Books lately printed for Richard Chiſwell.

The Peoples Right to read the Holy Scriptures aſſerted. In Anſwer to the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th Chapters of the [*Popiſh Reprſenter*, Second Part].

Two Diſcourſes: Of Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead. *Quarto.*

A Short Summary of the Principal Controverſies between the *Church of England*, and the *Church of Rome*. Being a Vindication of ſeveral Proteſtant Doctrines, in Anſwer to a late Pamphlet intituled [*Proteſtancy deſtitute of Scripture-Proofs*].

FINIS.